

St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly

Published by

the Faculty of St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, a graduate school of Theology
for all branches of the Orthodox Church.

Editorial Board

V. REV. ALEXANDER SCHMEMANN

PROF. NICHOLAS ARSENEV

REV. WILLIAM SCHNEIRLA

Volume I
New Series

July, 1957
Number 3

CONTENTS

Articles:

THE PHILOSOPHY OF OWNERSHIP

Bishop John of San Francisco 2

THE LATEST ORTHODOX-ANGLICAN CONFERENCE:

MOSCOW, 1956 — *Rev. William S. Schneirla* 7

RUSSIAN RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY

Nicholas Poltoratzky 23

SOME REMARKS ON CHRISTIAN-MUSLIM RELATIONS

IN BALKANS AND ANATOLIA — *Harry J. Psomiades* 36

Notes and Comments:

THE FOURTH LITURGICAL WEEK AT ST. SERGIUS

IN PARIS — *Rev. A. Schmemmann* 46

THE SEMINARY

..... 47

Editorial and Subscription Offices

537 West 121st Street, New York 27, New York
Tel: MOument 6-0065

LEONARD KIRVIDA, *Managing Editor*

Copyright 1957 by St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Yearly Subscription: \$3.00 Two Years \$5.00 Single Copy 80c

The Philosophy of Ownership

Bishop John of San Francisco

1. Man can only possess that which belongs to God. The world is God's creation and so is man. Man can in no way escape from God's ownership. To whatever depths he may sink, whatever heights he may ascend—everywhere there is God's ownership, infinite, inapprehensible, unfathomable. . . . Pilate sinks to the depths of treachery: he is ready to give the Innocent Sufferer to be crucified. And what does he hear from the Divine Wisdom? "Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above" (*John 19, 11*). Uniting in Himself and in all His words the fulness of the earthly and the heavenly, the Saviour indicated to Pilate, first, the Ceasars from whom he received his power, and also the Source of *all* power and ownership.

2. One may *conceal* oneself from God, from the sight of the Lord. Thus Adam hid in the bushes, concealing himself from God. This is the naive psychology of every sinner. "Adam, where art thou". . . "I hid myself. . ." Numberless years have passed since then, and the sons of Adam still imagine that they can hide from God. And they do 'hide' as best they can: in the overgrown and tangled ideological thickets of this world's culture—'private property', 'public property', 'state property', 'communism', 'capitalism', 'socialism', 'freedom', 'slavery', 'wealth', 'poverty', 'possessions', 'economic laws' and so on, and so on.

3. At the basis of everything complex there must be simplicity. If this primary simplicity is absent, there is chaos instead of complexity. But if the fundamental simplicity is present, the complexity will be a harmony. It is only in the light of knowledge of the primary laws of life laid down by the Creator that our complex secular culture can come to resemble an harmonious orchestra in which there are no superfluous instruments, or at least a well coordinated machine with no superfluous parts.

It is only through the knowledge of these *absolute* laws that we can estimate all human conceptions and determine their true significance. The world always has belonged and will belong to God alone, whatever forces may be temporary masters of it.

But does this mean that man has not and cannot have any property? On the contrary, human property has its firm basis in the fact that there is property as such, and that there is a Master of it all. And if there is a true Master, that means property may be *given*. What a broad and deep basis for all true pos-

session: In view of this basis it becomes comprehensible why one must not steal, must not appropriate anything, must not 'grow rich' and exalt oneself through anything.

All property belongs to God, just as life belongs to Him, and He gives property, just as He gives life.

4. Man is given 'a talent'—a span of physical life, of mental faculties, of spiritual possibilities. It is given not for burying in the ground, but for cultivating. The whole span of a man's life may be compared to a plot of ground. His duty is not to lie idly on this God-given ground but to cultivate it, to make the most of the life given into his stewardship as a token of a better life, better soil. "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much". Only that which is 'least' is given to man. However great in his earthly eyes this 'least' may seem, however great other people might call it, it is very small by comparison with that which it prefigures. But even this 'least' must be put into use for the benefit of the world. This is why rich people who make a creative use of their wealth, while living humbly, are true Christians in spite of their "great possessions".

"Mine is only that which I gave away" said St. Maxim the Confessor. Gave . . . to whom? To God, to men. . . . There are people who make no use of their wealth. Among them there are some who have 'hidden it for themselves', buried it in the ground, and there are some who have given it to God, believing that their duty is merely to distribute it in the world as justly as possible. This gracious *stewardship* of wealth finds different expressions. Some give their wealth away at once or by degrees. Others retain all the appearance of possession, but in their heart sincerely surrender it to God, so that their task is merely a fair distribution of it. It may take the form of ordinary economic enterprise, of a good industrial or agricultural business. *In appearance* it will be like all the works 'of this world', but in its inner content it will already be a small realization of the Kingdom of God . . .

Thus A. S. Khomiakov had land and serfs, and yet at bottom he was not his serfs' owner but rather their solicitous father and indeed their servant. This is the psychology of all wealthy Christians: landowners, industrialists, factory owners. . . . This too was the attitude of truly Orthodox Tsars.

When the Lord Jesus Christ said "he that is greatest among you shall be your servant" he meant by 'greatest' him who is rich, whether in money, or in rank, or in talent. . . . "The greatest" must serve and not exercise power through gifts (material or spiritual) which have been entrusted to him *for a time only*.

5. All *earthly* possessions are short lived and "full of trouble", for no sooner do they come and man gets attached to them than they disappear, abandoning

him to perplexity, pain, sorrow and death. They leave emptiness in their place, and dust in the place of man. But until possessions are replaced by emptiness they can bear "much fruit", even small possessions of the poor: the widow's mite proved to be a greater value, a greater good force than the treasures of the Pharisees.

6. A man has less property than he thinks. It is only in his imagination that a millionaire owns his millions — in truth they own him. For the most part he is fettered by them, compelled to a certain style of living, bound up with a particular set of people, inevitably surrounded by flattery, envy, insincerity, obsequiousness, solicitations, attempts on his life — physical and mental. . . Is not this slavery, penal servitude, increasing in severity with the increase in wealth? Does that which can be bought for money amount to much? Can *spiritual peace* — the highest happiness — be bought?

7. But from another point of view a man's possessions are *far greater than he thinks*. Every breath of air which gets into his lungs is his property, far more so than a coin in his pocket, for it directly supports his life. Every ray of sunshine that warms a man is *his* warmth, wholly united to him. . . And so in everything, in the smallest manifestations of life man is surrounded with *property*, with God's gifts poured out upon him and transmuted into his very life. Great and glorious is this law which makes every man rich.

8. In order to enter into the harmony of the world that became discordant but is now being put into tune again, a man must in all conscience (and not merely with his intellect) recognize God's power and himself become God's property, since the universe already is His property. Numberless myriads of worlds, suns, stars, innumerable septillions of lives move within the limits laid down by the Creator. Stones, water, air, earth, fire, obey immutable laws which man may detect, which are for him 'to discover' . . . What for? For the sake of learning how to live rightly in accordance with these laws. Submission to physical laws is only a symbol of submission to God's spiritual laws. Just as physical nature reveals itself to man in natural science, physics, chemistry, mechanics, cosmography and so on, so spiritual nature is revealed in the Gospel. Observing the subordination of physical nature to God, man must learn to subordinate his spirit to Him.

9. A sober-minded and unprejudiced man naturally thinks and sees that his earthly possessions are more than 'relative' . . . Centuries melt away and so does all human property on earth. All earthly 'rights' of individuals, cities and nations — the right to own land and goods, even the right to live — disappear into thin air.

The only thing indestructible in the universe is the Divine power which creates the worlds. All else is fragile and destructible. *And it is destructible*

imply in order that men should not regard the destructible as indestructible. In the life of the world to come, when "the wheat is gathered," i.e., when men who were righteous and loved God will be gathered from all the ages — no one will be in danger of loving the creature more than the Creator, and then once more, as in Paradise, *the destructible will become indestructible*. But no one will deify eternal and indestructible nature. All will contemplate the glory of God alone and in its unutterable light see the whole of existence and find their undying life eternally renewed.

10. This state is impossible for us on earth, for we always love someone or something more than God. Our heart is 'adulterous' in the deepest religious sense of the word. This is why the Saviour (Who never spoke unjustly) called men "an *adulterous* and sinful generation". Fallen humanity is attached to transitory values, cleaves to the pleasures of this world, to its illusory wealth and its equally illusory glory. If it were not for worms, rust, moth, locusts, stench, corruption, suffering and death — the world would be a *living hell*. Some people fancy that the reverse is true: if there were no pain and sorrow on this earth it would be 'paradise'. *But it would be hell*. The sinfulness of earthly flesh is covered by earthly sorrows. The blessed salt of suffering preserves human spirit from decay and eternal death. It preserves it in people who understand and accept Christ's 'narrow way'.

This is why *all the ways of the Lord* are blessed for the righteous, "true and righteous altogether," in the words of the Psalmist. Thus, *blessed* is the Cross of every life on this transitory earth.

11. Human life finds its highest expression in complete devotion to God. As man is freed from "the pride of life, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes" (from materialism of every sort) he becomes more and more 'transparent' to God, so that the purest Spirit of God may dwell in him. And when man is completely transparent, free from all pride, from all sinful fondness for oneself and the world, God's property—the world—will become his property, and 'having nothing' and not even belonging to himself, he will "possess all things" as St. Paul (2 Cor. 6, 16). God will abide in man and will make his life rich and restful. This serene harmony of life is the Kingdom of God.

12. The sequence of temporal life is given to man as a ladder for ascending to eternal life. Only he who is faithful "in that which is least (the temporal) is faithful also in much" (the eternal). While we are still here on earth we must learn to live the eternal life. Those who are not grafted to God's Vine (John 15, 5) cannot live. Mounting the ladder of earthly life and earthly values (i.e. drawing away from them) we enter into the Kingdom of God. But if a man draws away from the values of the world *in a wrong direction* (e.g. a despairing man, a suicide), he falls into an abyss.

13. The material world is a 'staff' for the sick soul, its anchor, the point of application of the primary forces of the spirit — a staff which helps us to ascend to God, if we know how to use it. Everything in the world is created or is permitted for man's benefit and he can convert even the most trying and painful manifestations of earthly life (sometimes, indeed, better than any other) into a path to paradise.

14. The material world provides endless means of salvation, of attaining God. But such means are open only to the disinterested. For those who seek gain, the world is nothing but a net and fatal snare.

15. Property based upon love of God and a free heart is blessed. Property that is a *gift* brings a blessing with it. *Usurped* property brings down a curse. Possession may be avaricious or disinterested; avaricious possession is selfish, and disinterested — *eucharistic*. True human possession is to be found only in eucharistic property which comes from God and goes back to God through man. Only this spiritually-light possession which does not weigh down the spirit, which does not nail us to temporal life or attract us to sin, can be called 'blessed'. Truly it is blessed, whatever form it may take — possession of talents, gifts, things, lands, other people. All this is blessed — when it is in God. And all this is accursed when it separates us from God and makes the world into a god.

16. Eucharistic possession means everything for which people can thank God — and those through whom God gives it. Such gratitude implies both faith in God and the recognition that He is the Master of life. Through gratitude for life and for everything — the highest and most perfect expression of which is the *Eucharist* — man ascends to a new life, to the Kingdom of God. The infinitely small values of this world, salted with gratitude to God, become man's eucharistic property and remain 'his' forever as something new and great, transferred beyond the portals of eternity.

17. Property is a *conductor of love*, Divine and human. But men often make it a conductor of hatred for God and man. It is not property that is at fault, not the fact of possession, but *evil* possession or evil desire for possession.

18. Man is called to subdue the earth (*Gen. 1, 28*), and he is to *inherit* the earth (*Matt. 5, 5*).

The Latest Orthodox-Anglican Conference: Moscow, 1956

Rev. William S. Schneirla

[N JULY, 1955, a delegation of Russian churchmen, composed of four Orthodox, two Lutherans, and two Baptists, visited the churches in the British Isles, and were the guests of Archbishop Geoffrey Fisher of Canterbury at Lambeth Palace. The Orthodox representatives were Metropolitan Pitirim of Minsk and Byelorussia; Archpriest Constantine Ivanovich Ruzhitsky, Rector of the Moscow Theological Academy; Father Philaret Denisenko, a lecturer at the Academy, and Professor Nicholas Dmitrievich Uspensky, of the Leningrad Theological Academy. During the visit Metropolitan Pitirim announced that he had been authorized to invite a group of British churchmen to visit the Soviet Union. Following talks between the Orthodox visitors and representatives of the Church of England, the Anglicans informed the press that delegates of their Church would visit Moscow in the summer of 1956 to discuss intercommunion. The preliminary conversations at Lambeth were, "amicable and principally concerned with procedural matters,"¹ it was said, and an Anglican spokesman added that a tentative agenda for the Moscow meeting had been agreed upon.

The Russian visit to England coincided with a number of visits by church groups to and from Russia, and occurred at a time when Soviet policy seemed to be directed toward promoting friendship with the west. Its announced purpose was not primarily concerned with the establishment of improved relations between the Russian Church and Anglicanism, and the inclusion of four non-Orthodox delegates, as well as the unexpected and tentative nature of the announcement of a further meeting, suggests that plans for a Moscow conference in 1956 arose more or less accidentally out of Orthodox Anglican meetings after the arrival of the churchmen who accompanied Metropolitan Pitirim.

The Background

Orthodox and Anglican contacts were relatively numerous, if somewhat ambiguous, during the 19th century, and increased in intensity after 1898, but did not appear to be drawing the churches closer together in any practical way until after World War I. Then, largely due to the efforts of Meletios (Metaxakis) who, as Patriarch of Constantinople in 1922, and as Patriarch of Alexandria from 1926, twice stimulated synodical statements on Anglican

Orders, the churches of Jerusalem, Cyprus, and Romania officially considered Anglican Apostolic Succession and made affirmative statements, while a number of conferences discussed a wider measure of agreement.

The Church in Russia was necessarily excluded from all of this development after 1917, and the Conference of 1956 is the first major official Russian action since World War I. Before the Communist Revolution, however, there had been innumerable friendly contacts. Disregarding the state visits of hierarchs, and the interchange of theological opinions, there remains a background of official action against which current Russian negotiations may be viewed.

As is true with so many of the national branches of the Orthodox Church, the first official Russian action evoked by Anglicanism was inspired by the petition of the Non-Juring British bishops in the eighteenth century. Although the Non-Jurors were not in the Establishment, this fact was either unknown by the Orthodox, or disregarded by them, and the Synodical Reply of the Patriarchs to the British has been called a Symbolic Book.² No one would deny that the Non-Jurors reflected contemporary Anglican theology of a rather "High" tradition. The Russian Church acted as intermediary in the negotiations and in letters written to the British Churchmen in 1723 and 1724, the Holy Synod suggested the sending of official representatives to Russia. The Non-Juror project ended inconclusively, the reason usually given being the intervention of Archbishop Wake of Canterbury at Constantinople and the death of Peter the Great, but the documentary exchange did not give promise of early agreement.

Abundant material exists for a study of private and unofficial impressions of both bodies by members of the other, of which the preface of John Glenn King's *Rites of the Greek Church in Russia* is a readily available Anglican example, in the years following the abortive exchange between Orthodoxy and the Non-Jurors, but it is not until 1842 that a significant formal pronouncement appears. In that year William Palmer presented letters from the Scottish Bishop Luscomb, and asked to be received into communion with Orthodoxy on the strength of them. His request was answered by the Holy Synod,

"Seeing that the British Church has never yet by any Synodal act, expressed her purpose of restoring that union with the Orthodox Church which she has lost, by disavowing all dogmas contrary to our Orthodox Confession; and seeing that the present letters of a single Bishop with the Petition of a single Deacon, as expressing no more than the opinions of individuals, are in no wise matters for Synodal deliberation, the Holy Synod for these reasons cannot admit the petitioner (Palmer) to the Communion of our Church otherwise than by the Rite prescribed for converts from heterodoxy."³

The Archbishop of Volhynia, who presided at the Holy Synod when the letters came before it, later indicated the result desired from the statement to

Palmer, "We hope that the Scottish Bishops will now synodically express their desire for union, so that the Russian Synod may be able to treat with them directly."⁴ The Russians recalled the incident of the Non-Jurors and the unequivocal demands made of them by the Patriarchs. Palmer, whose optimism was not easily exhausted, actually prepared a 'harmony' of Orthodox and Anglican doctrine to be ratified by the Scottish Church, and appears to have been genuinely surprised when that body declined to confess the major tenets of the Orthodox faith.

Friendly associations multiplied during the remainder of the nineteenth century, but no formal action was taken until 1902. Then, in reply to an encyclical of inquiry on some internal problems as well as relations with the various non-Orthodox Christians sent to the autocephalous Churches by the Oecumenical Patriarch Joachim III, the Holy Synod offered an opinion on the Anglicans,

"As regards our relations toward . . . the Latins and Protestants, the Russian Church . . . ever prays, awaits, and frequently desires that those who in times of old were children of Mother Church and sheep of one flock of Christ, but who have been torn away by the envy of the foe and are wandering astray . . . should once more return to the bosom of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, to their one Shepherd . . . The Anglicans . . . with rare exceptions . . . do not aim at the perversion of Orthodox Christians, and upon every occasion and opportunity strive to show their special respect for the Holy Apostolic Eastern Church, traditions of the Fathers, and in union and agreement with her seeking a justification for themselves. Love and goodwill cannot but call forth love on our side also, and nourish in us the good hope of the possibility of Church union with them in the future. But . . . much still remains to be done and to be explained, before that it will be possible to think of any sort of definite step in one or in the other direction. And, first of all, it is most indispensable that the desire for union with the Eastern Orthodox Church should become the sincere desire not only of a certain fraction of Anglicanism (the "High Church"), but of the whole Anglican community, that the other purely Calvinistic current which in essence rejects the Church, as we understand her, and whose attitude towards Orthodoxy is one of particular intolerance, should be absorbed in the above-mentioned pure current, and should lose its perceptible, if we may not say inclusive, influence upon the Church policy and in general upon the whole Church life of this Confession which, in the main, is exempt from enmity towards us. On our side, is our relations towards the Anglicans, there ought to be a brotherly readiness to assist them with explanations, an habitual attentiveness to their best desires, all possible indulgence towards misunderstandings which are natural after ages of separation, but at the same time a firm profession of the truth of our Oecumenical Church as the one guardian of the inheritance of Christ and the one saving ark of Divine Grace."⁵

In 1904 Archbishop Tikhon, first Patriarch of Moscow of the revived line, and then head of the American Orthodox Church, requested the Holy Synod to determine whether or not Protestant Episcopalians who converted to the Church in a group might be permitted to retain the use of the American Book of Common Prayer, and whether or not Episcopalian clergymen who con-

verted to Orthodoxy should be reordained if they desired to continue their ministry. The Holy Synod appointed a Commission which submitted a detailed report, this was accepted, approved and subsequently implemented and acted upon by the Synod.⁶ The Report discussed the American Book of Common Prayer in considerable detail, passing negative judgement on portions of all of the major rites. The conclusions were quite moderate, however, and consistent with the usual Russian willingness to concede to use of a western rite.

"The examination of the 'Book of Common Prayer' leads to the general conclusion that its actual contents present comparatively very little that clearly contradicts Orthodox teaching, and therefore would not be admissible in Orthodox worship. But this conclusion comes not from the fact that the book is actually Orthodox, but merely from the fact that it was compiled in a spirit of compromise, and that, while skillfully evading all more or less debatable points of doctrine, it endeavors to reconcile tendencies which are really contradictory. Consequently both those who profess protestantism and their opponents can alike use it with a quiet conscience. But worship which is so indefinite and colorless (in its denominational bearing) cannot, of course, be accepted as satisfactory for sons of the Orthodox Church, who are not afraid of their confession of Faith, and still less for sons who have only just joined the Orthodox Church from Anglicanism. If it were, their prayer would not be a full expression of their new beliefs, such as it ought essentially to be.

The committee, after reviewing these 'Observations,' allowed in general the possibility that if Orthodox parishes, composed of former Anglicans, were organized in America, they might be allowed, at their desire, to perform their worship according to the 'Book of Common Prayer', but only on condition that the following corrections were made in the spirit of the Orthodox Church. On the one hand everything must be removed from the Book that bears a clearly non-orthodox character — the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Confession, the Catechism with its protestant teaching about the sacraments, the *Filioque*, the idea of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the sole source of the teaching of the Faith, etc. On the other hand, there must be inserted into the text of the prayers and rites contained in the Book those Orthodox beliefs which it is essentially necessary to profess in Orthodox worship — into the rite of Liturgy, the profession of belief in the change of the Holy Gifts into the Body and Blood of Christ, and of belief in the sacrificial significance of the Eucharist; into the rite of ordination (chirotony) the belief in the divine establishment of the ministry with its distinction of degrees, and the recognition of the distinctive right of the priest to offer the bloodless sacrifice. Into all the services in general prayers must be inserted addressed to the Blessed Mother of God, to Angels and Saints, with the glorification and invocation of them (direct), also prayers for the dead (especially in the Liturgy and the Burial Service). There must be included in liturgical practice, and put into the Book, the missing rites for the sacraments of penance, chrismation and unction, and the rite of consecration of churches (as distinct from the consecration of a house of prayer); and finally there must be introduced the cult of sacred Icons. But since the detailed changes in the 'Prayer Book', and, generally speaking, in Anglican liturgical practice together with the compilation of new prayers and even entire rites can be carried out only on the spot, in America, in correspondence with existing demands and conditions, it is found desirable to send the 'Observations' themselves to the Right Rev. Tikhon, the American Bishop. They

will thus serve in the negotiations as materials for the determination in detail of the conditions on which Anglicans disposed to Orthodoxy can be received. As regards the reception of clergy from Anglicanism, the committee has proposed (pending a final judgment of the question by the Church) to offer to those who join a new conditional ordination."

Curiously, the Anglican response to this Report, which requires something less of the Prayer Book than does any of the Anglo-Catholic "Missals," did not result in either mass conversions to Orthodoxy or immediate changes in any of the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion.

The final official declaration before the onset of the difficulties which disorganized the Patriarchal administration for a time, came from the All-Russian Sobor of 1917-18. In its concluding meeting on September 20, 1918, it passed the following Resoution:

"The Sacred Council of the Orthodox Russian Church, gladly seeing the sincere efforts of the Old Catholics and Anglicans towards union with the Orthodox Church on the foundation of the doctrine and tradition of the ancient Catholic Church, bestows its benediction on the labors and efforts of those who are seeking the way towards union with the above-named friendly Churches. The Council authorizes the Sacred Synod to organize a Permanent Commission with departments in Russia and abroad for the further study of Old Catholic and Anglican difficulties in the way of union, and for the furtherance as much as possible of the speedy attainment of the final aim."

Because of the peculiar domestic problems confronting the Russian Church in the second and third decades of this century, there was no possibility of implementing the resolution of the All-Russian Sobor. In July 1948, however, the Patriarchate celebrated the five-hundredth anniversary of the autocephality of the Russian Church by convening a Pan-Orthodox Conference in Moscow. This assembly of heads and representatives of the autocephalous Churches considered, as one of several major topics, the question of the validity of Anglican Orders and issued a Resolution.⁷ In three principal points the Resolution declares: a) A necessary prerequisite to the recognition of Anglican Orders is the identity of Anglican and Orthodox dogma on the Sacraments. Private declarations by hierarchs are insufficient; the Thirty-nine Articles are inadequate. Previous recognitions by particular Orthodox Churches were conditional; b) Recognition of Orders is dependent on an authoritative "Act" of the whole Anglican Church indicating "Unity of faith" with Orthodoxy. This implies changes in Anglican doctrine. c) The Conference is sympathetic to Anglican desires for contacts "between the believers of the Anglican Church and the Church Universal," and once unity of faith is established by the Anglicans, recognition of Orders can be "accomplished in accordance with the principle of Economy", by the only decision binding on Orthodoxy—an oecumenical decision of the whole Orthodox Church.

While this Resolution is, by any standards, the most consistent official contribution ever made to the Anglican Orthodox dialogue by the Church, it was deplored as too negative by some Anglicans, and an American Episcopal journal, moderately High Church, pointed out that Anglicans consider themselves as already members of the "Church Universal," and attributed the unsatisfactory tenor of the Resolution to political bias.⁸

It will be seen that Orthodox responses to Anglican overtures, from the Non-Jurors to 1948, typically stress the importance of doctrinal agreement and subordinate all other considerations, including the Anglican preoccupation with Orders, to it. The response of the Russian Holy Synod to the Oecumenical Patriarch in 1902, confines itself to the question of a common faith to the exclusion of all reference to Orders, and the Resolution of 1948 makes the same approach. Although separated by half a century, the two Russian statements might have been drafted by the same commission. Charges of political motivation become less convincing when the documents are compared.

It was with this long history of sympathetic interest and cordial exchange of ideas, as well as commitment to definite official precedents, that the Russian Church met the Anglican delegate in 1956.

Personnel and Program of the 1956 Conference

An account of the visit of the Anglican delegation to Moscow in July 1956, together with a resume of the conferences held, and the text of three of the papers presented by the representatives of the Orthodox Church in Russia appeared in the ninth number (September) of the official *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* for 1956. The series of articles opens with an itinerary and diary by Bishop Michael of Smolensk, "The Delegations of the Theologians of the Anglican Church to the Soviet Union," pp. 24-33, followed by the agenda of the Conference, the register of the participants, and a day by day resume of the discussion, pp. 33-37. The texts of three of the Russian papers are provided, "Sacred Scripture," pp. 47-55, by A. Osipov, a Professor of the Leningrad Theological Academy; "Doctrine and Opinion," pp. 55-58, by Father A. Vetelev, a Professor of the Moscow Academy; "The Creeds of the Faith and the Councils," pp. 58-62, by Archpriest V. Borovoi, a Professor of the Leningrad Academy. Six half-tone engravings are devoted to the visit.

The twelve members of the Russian delegation are listed as follows: 1) Bishop Michael of Smolensk; 2) Bishop Sergei of Starorussia and Darogbuzh, 3) Archpriest K. I. Ruzhitski, Rector of the Moscow Theological Academy, 4) Archpriest A. A. Vetelev, Professor of the Moscow Academy, 5) A. I. Ivanov of the Moscow Academy, 6) A. A. Osipov of the Leningrad Academy, 7) L. N. Pariski of the Leningrad Academy, 8) N. D. Uspenski

of the Leningrad Academy, 9) V. M. Borovoi, Docent of the Leningrad Academy, 10) A. I. Georgievski, Docent of the Moscow Academy, 11) K. V. Nichaev, Docent of the Moscow Academy, 13) V. D. Sarichev, Docent of the Moscow Academy. The members of the Anglican Delegation were, Archbishop Michael Ramsey of York, Bishop A. Rawlinson of Derby, Bishop G. Carpenter of Oxford, Canon B. Waddams, General Secretary of the Department of Foreign Relations of the Anglican Church, and the Rev. Dr. O. Chadwick (Cambridge), the Rev. G. Williams (Cambridge), the Rev. P. Taylor (Oxford), the Rev. D. Findlow, Chaplain of the British Embassy in Rome, and Mr. Paul Anderson who is described as "councillor to Bishop Sheril, the head of the Episcopal Church in the U. S. A."

The Delegation, Bishop Michael calls the Anglicans "dear guests," was met late in the evening of July 13th at the Vnukovsky airport of Moscow by a group of Orthodox representatives headed by Metropolitan Nicholas of Krutitsky, and by the British Ambassador. In addition to the theological discussions, which extended from July 16th to 23rd, the Anglicans were "acquainted with the life of our country," p. 26. Numerous churches in the Moscow area were visited during services, the local rectors and the guests exchanging addresses. It was noted that, "the sincere friendliness of the guests of the Orthodox Church . . . found expression in their pious veneration of the holy objects kept in our churches . . . (the) . . . Anglican Bishops and Priests crossed themselves and kissed the wonder-working and revered icons," (p. 26) in the Moscow churches and, "all reverently kissed," the reliquary of St. Sergius in the Troitsky-Sergievy Lavra (p. 28). On the feast of the Bogoroditsa of Kazan the Anglicans, "reverently venerated the Kazan Icon of the Theotokos and the relics of St. Alexis, Metropolitan of Moscow." At the former Donskoi Monastery the guests visited the grave of Patriarch Tikhon "where they made a brief prayerful commemoration of the noted hierarchy, who in his time worked for the wellbeing of the North American Metropolia, where the contacts between Orthodoxy and Anglicanism were particularly close." (p. 28)

Archbishop Ramsey left for England after the discussion ended, but the other guests remained to visit Vladimir and Leningrad, returning to Moscow to spend their final day at the suburban residence of the Patriarch.

In summing up Bishop Michael writes, "Studying the life of the Russian Orthodox Church, its hierarchy, clergy and laity, the Anglican Church representatives have shown great interest in the activity of millions of our people, in its great historical past and in the peaceful construction work that is in the process of accomplishment. Meeting the requests of its guests, the Moscow Patriarchate organized numerous excursions, both in Moscow and its vicinity

and in Leningrad. The purpose of these trips was to present the historical, artistic, and scientific treasures of our country, and also the technical achievements of our industry and agriculture. The guests often drove in the city and its vicinity, using various roads. On the very first day of their stay in Moscow the delegates visited the Moscow subway named in honor of V. I. Lenin . . . In order to provide the guests with a wide acquaintance with the life of our country they were shown a number of films during their stay in Moscow . . . When leaving for home the members of the Anglican delegation, in a most sincere way, expressed their warm gratitude to His Holiness Patriarch Alexis, Metropolitan Nicholas and all of the officials of the Moscow Patriarchate, for the most hearty welcome received. The delegates expressed the conviction that similar meetings can and must further better understanding between the churches and the people who belong to them."

The Delegation met B. G. Karpov, Chairman of the Soviet of Church Affairs, of the Soviet Ministers of the USSR, as well as various other state officials, and was present at a reception and banquet. They were present in vestments during services, and spoke, but there is no suggestion of participation in religious services except as observers.

The theological discussions occupied the period from July 16th to the 23rd, excluding the 18th and the 22nd. On the 16th, Bishop Michael and Mr. Anderson outlined the history of Orthodox Anglican relations, the Bishop of Oxford read a paper on the nature of the Church, and Professor Parisky presented summaries of papers on the nature of the Church, and the role of the laity. In the ensuing discussion the Orthodox affirmed that a satisfactory agreement on faith, the Apostolic Succession and Sacraments, must precede the recognition of any Church as part of Christ's One, True, Church. The Anglicans noted that the "Lambeth Quadrilateral" included these points and added Holy Scripture to them. Both sides agreed that complete unity is possible if an agreement is reached on 1) the content of faith and its sources, Scripture and Tradition, 2) the hierarchy, 3) the Sacraments.

On July 17th, Professor Osipov read a paper on the Scriptures, summarized below, and Bishop Sergius a paper on Tradition, while the Archbishop of York spoke on the same topics for the Anglican delegation. Both sides agreed on the same Canon of Scripture, and both agreed that only the books in the Hebrew Canon are divinely inspired while the so-called Apocrypha are "profitable and edifying." Inspiration was not considered in detail, but there was a discussion of "differences of opinion as to the extent of the human element in Holy Scripture." Both groups accepted the Hebrew and LXX as the authoritative Old Testament text, and the Orthodox receive only the *textus receptus* in the New Testament, while the Anglicans employ other texts in liturgical

practice. Both Churches understood Tradition as "divinely revealed truths transmitted from the Apostles through the Fathers." "The Orthodox Church considers Holy Tradition an independent source of the teaching of faith, on the level with Holy Scripture. The Anglican Church is of the opinion that Holy Tradition cannot add anything necessary for faith to the content of the Holy Scripture."

On the third day, July 19th, Professor Vetelev and Canon Waddams presented papers on "Doctrine and Opinion;" that of Vetelev is contained in the *Journal* and summarized below. The Rev. Dr. Chadwick, presented "Doctrine and Formulation." Following the lectures the terms *dogma*, *theologoumena*, and *theological opinion* were discussed. The Orthodox affirmed that the Creeds and definitions of the Seven Oecumenical Councils are unalterable truths of the teaching of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, and that, while the content of dogmas may be "unfolded", there can be no development in the sense of changing the content. The Anglicans stated that "the Oecumenical Councils defined the faith as it is accepted in the Anglican Church," but that there is no official Anglican statement of the number of Oecumenical Councils that must be accepted. "The Anglicans expressed the viewpoint that the existence of different opinions in the Church may serve as a better understanding of the faith and the propagation of Christianity to people outside of the Church."

On July 20th Professor V. M. Borovoi spoke on "Creeds and Councils," and Bishop Rawlinson of Derby and Professor K. V. Nechaev on "The Filioque." The Orthodox opened the discussion by insisting that the Nicene Creed without the *Filioque* is the "Oecumenical Creed," and part of the "dogmatic decisions (of the Seven Oecumenical Councils) which are immutable truths of faith of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church" . . . The Anglicans conceded that the insertion of the *filioque* was uncanonical, and in principle recognized that it should not have been added, but they declined to "Consider the word itself as heresy and . . . the faith confessed by the Anglican Church is identical with the faith of the Oecumenical Councils and with the faith of the Creed in its original form."

The proceedings on the fifth day, July 21st, were opened by papers on the Sacraments, Their Number and Nature by C. I. Ruzhitsky and G. Williams. The Orthodox affirmed that the seven Sacraments are all of divine institution and that Orthodox Sacramental dogma "is based on the Holy Scripture, Holy Tradition, decisions of the Oecumenical Councils and patristic testimony." The Anglicans affirmed that the Orthodox position "is in agreement with the basic teachings of the Anglican Church, however, the Anglican Church makes a distinction between the Sacraments of Baptism and Com-

munion which, according to the Holy Scriptures were instituted by Christ himself, and the other five Sacraments. Anglican Confirmation corresponds to Orthodox Chrismation, and "The Anglican theologians accepted completely the Orthodox point of view in regard to the consecration of the Holy Gifts in the Sacrament of the Eucharist."

The meeting on July 23rd opened with a continuation of the discussion on the Sacraments, then A. I. Georgievsky presented, "The Meaning and Significance of Rites in the Orthodox Church," and the Rev. P. Taylor, the "Orthodox Customs which may create difficulties for Anglicans." In discussion the Orthodox "pointed out that the veneration of the Mother of God (*Bozhiei Materi*), the invocation of the Saints in prayer, the use of icons, and prayer for the departed are not customs which may be peculiar to a local church, but are immutable dogmas of the Oecumenical Church." The rites "are important outward signs for soliciting and receiving grace." In their essential parts they cannot be revoked or arbitrarily changed, having an Apostolic origin. The Anglicans adhered to earlier Anglican positions taken in formal discussion with the Orthodox, on the question of Sacraments, specifically the Conferences of 1931 and 1935.⁹ The Anglicans tried to clarify the historical conditions which would present obstacles to English Christians in accepting some of the Orthodox rites, and veneration.

The Russian Papers

The first Russian paper printed in full is *The Holy Scriptures*, by Professor A. Osipov. In addition to the points outlined in the resume of the first day of discussion, Osipov traces the history of the Orthodox Canon and places the Old Testament books and sections, called Apocrypha by the Protestants, in an uninspired, uncanonical (*nekanonicheskie*) category and includes III Esdras in the Canon in a third category. This is of course, one of two positions held by Orthodox Scripture students. The inclusion of III Esdras is the result of western influence in Russia and Osipov is quite clear on this point, but it is difficult to sustain the position that the so-called Apocrypha are on a lower level than any other books in the Canon—the inclusion of a book in the Canon depends on the lists given in the Oecumenical documents. If the fullest catalogue is not accepted for the Old Testament, as it was by the Jerusalem Council of 1672, quoted by Osipov, would not two levels be required in the New Testament as well? There is no warrant for denying the full inspiration of the complete Canon, and Osipov here follows an inconsistent Russian deviation, sanctified by the name of Metropoitan Philaret. Osipov is certain that in Orthodoxy the *textus receptus* is normative for the New Testament, unbroken official use having conferred a superiority not to be challenged by re-

visions based on more ancient manuscripts. Exegesis must be in the spirit of tradition, the Fathers and Councils. After reviewing, rather briefly, Anglican doctrine on Scripture, confining himself to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the London Conference of 1936, he concludes that the Anglican Canon is "comparable" to the Oecumenical, and the position on "non-canonical" books as to value and inspiration is the same "in principle." Further clarification is needed on these questions: Do the Anglicans have the Orthodox doctrine of Inspiration? Do the Anglicans accept the Russian list of non-Canonical books, and concede the same value to them? Do the Anglicans accept the Orthodox (i.e. Philaret's) position on the LXX? Do the Anglicans "accept for the New Testament the *textus receptus* as uninterruptedly and permanently used by the Church and sanctified by its Councils, life and tradition?" It seems that some of these questions were answered in the first day's discussion; see above.

The second paper printed in the *Journal* is Professor Vetelev's *Doctrine and Opinion*. Dogmas are divinely revealed truths of faith and morals necessary for salvation, contained in their unalterable fullness in Scripture and Tradition as preserved by the Church. There is no development, but dogmas may be explicit or implicit. Implicit dogmas may simply expound the content of explicit dogmas. The Symbolic Books "unfold" the Oecumenical formulae in response to need. Orthodoxy has a living organ for expounding dogma and condemning error in the collective episcopate. (In Vetelev's words the organ is, "The voice of its pastors, councils, Holy Synods, which either approve or condemn every newly formulated expression of faith.") In response to the inexhaustible content of dogma man's receptivity is enriched and widened. In addition to dogmas, Orthodoxy knows theologumena and personal theological opinions. Theologumena are "patristic theological opinions of the undivided church on the basic questions of faith." Their importance is directly related to the patristic consensus, but they are not irreformable without Oecumenical confirmation. Since theologians must contend with problems for which no developed solution is provided in either dogma or theologumena there are theological opinions. If the opinions do not contradict dogma or violate Tradition in bringing "something new into the solution of the problem," they approach theologumena in value. The opinions of Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow and Bishop Theophan of Vzhinsk are examples. If they contradict Scripture and theologumena they must be condemned by theological science and the Church. The teaching of Metropolitan Antony Khrapovitsky on Redemption and the Sophiology of Father Sergius Bulgakov are examples. Dogmas are formulated in response to heresy and by their appearance limit the subsequent interpretation of the terms employed.

The third paper is *The Creeds and the Councils* of Professor V. Borovoi.

All dogmas are given in Revelation preserved and infallibly interpreted by the Church in Scripture and Tradition, the formulated expressions of which are the incomparable Creeds of the Conciliar period. Orthodoxy is self-defined as "true Christianity in its completeness," and this is evidenced in part by her contribution of the Nicene Creed to Christianity. Anglicanism accepted this creed as the paramount expression of the faith of the Oecumenical Church at the Lambeth (London) meeting of 1931. Orthodoxy also insists on the acceptance of the dogmatic decrees of the Seven Oecumenical Councils, which were "organs of the Holy Spirit" in dogma, and the highest organ of the Church in disciplinary and administrative matters. The Acts of the Councils imply their ultimate dogmatic, creedal, investigative and determinative authority in dogma and administration. They claim the infallibility promised by Christ to the Church, and their status was confirmed "by the witness of (the Church's) consciousness." Neither Papal nor civil approval, nor universal representation, is required, for "the very life of the Church and its history pronounces its judgement on the Councils." This may be a protracted process. To be Oecumenical, a Church must accept the Seven Councils. The Anglicans, 'although claiming to be the successor of the undivided Church,' have "wavered" on the Councils; especially in Article 31. There is uncertainty as to whether four or six are received, but the seventh definitely is not. Although Borovoi writes that agreements reached with the Old Catholics (1931) and Romanians (1935) presuppose and include the acceptance of the Oecumenical Creeds and the dogmatic decrees of the Seven Councils, in fact, in the light of traditional Anglican hesitations, the significant feature of the two agreements is the omission of specific reference to the Seven Councils. Professor Borovoi concludes that the acceptance of the Nicene Creed and the dogmatic decrees of the Seven Councils, "according to the deep conviction of the Orthodox Church is the basic characteristic of any church which claims to be the successor of the undivided Church."

Of the three papers the least satisfactory is that on Holy Scripture, but that is because the author faithfully reflects the main current of Russian Scriptural tradition, which was for a long time in tension between the counter appeals of Papal and Protestant positions on the Canon, particularly on the extent of Inspiration. The study is too Russian in all respects, particularly if the Moscow Conference is to contribute to wider Orthodox Anglican conversations, but probably this is not a valid criticism of the author's intent.

The papers on dogma and the Oecumenical Councils are adequate to their purpose, and certainly reveal no accommodation to Anglicanism. Probably both authors would address Orthodox colleagues somewhat differently. It would be interesting to know which contemporaries of Bulgakov and Metro-

politan Antony Professor Veletev would have substituted for Metropolitan Philaret and Bishop Theophan. Professor Borovoi's conclusion that the Anglicans have accepted all of the Councils, in the face of his own accurate outline of the English position, is unexpected. Professor Borovoi is fond of the expression "the undivided Church," which as an abstraction in Anglican and Old Catholic apologetics, is as meaningless as it is attractive. There never was an undivided Church except in the sense that Orthodoxy, or Rome for that matter, claims to have been from Pentecost to the present. Since the theologians involved on both sides spoke as official representatives of their respective traditions, an observer must resist the temptation to comment on their personal and theological backgrounds as these might be expected to condition individual contributions to the Conference.

Some Comments

The *Journal's* collection of documents and other material is exclusively Orthodox, and the Anglican participants might want to shift emphases here and there. A balanced presentation would include some of the Anglican papers and comments. The Anglicans emerge from the skeleton of the discussions as expected, however they cannot be accused of the undue concession attributed to the Delegation to Romania in 1935. It is difficult to assess their presentation on the scanty evidence offered in the *Journal*, but one may assume that they were not very precise on the *filioque*. Once again, as always in Orthodox Anglican conversations, it is obvious that the Anglicans are not yet prepared to renounce their distinctive tradition and capitulate to Orthodoxy. Their goal is intercommunion on a "comprehensive" basis, and they await the day when Orthodoxy will share this ideal with them. The resume does not show progress in the discussions from day to day and little, if any, advance beyond former conferences in which the Russian Church did not participate. In general the Moscow theologians were more conservative than some of their non-Russian Orthodox predecessors have been.

In appraising the Conference two questions immediately present themselves. If, as the Moscow Resolution of 1948 insists, the final determination of the status of the Anglican Church depends on an Oecumenical action of Orthodoxy, what purpose is served by another conference between representatives of a single autocephalous Church, and delegates of one branch of the Anglican Communion? If the Church expects absolute, and official, Anglican conformity to Orthodox doctrine what did this Conference require to supplement the declarations on which the Alexandrian and Romanian recognitions are based?

The material in the *Journal* offers no real clue for an answer to the first question and one is left with the original assumption: the Conference was in-

cidental to the service of wider purposes. Bishop Michael's careful insistence that the Anglicans were properly exposed to the technological magnificence of the worker's paradise may indicate one of them. It is probable that all sorts of peripheral ends were satisfied, and for the Russian Churchmen this must have been a valuable opportunity to move outside of the restrictions imposed by their long isolation.

Since the Russians patiently traversed an agenda that has been repeatedly reviewed in Orthodox Anglican conferences, without retreating from conservative precedents, it must follow that they were not satisfied with Anglican responses in the past. The Moscow Resolution of 1948 looked for an authoritative Anglican declaration of conformity to the Orthodox faith. Other particular Orthodox Churches had granted recognition of Orders on official Anglican assurances of conformity, but the Resolution of 1948 characterized these as "conditional." So far as this writer knows, that was the first time any Orthodox authority had so described the several statements on Anglican Orders. Were the Russians hoping for a more definite commitment from the English?

The letter and encyclical of Constantinople in 1922 granted recognition without reference to Anglican dogma, stating that such recognition was already given for Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian orders. The Jerusalem letter of 1923 was simply motivated by the act of Constantinople. The Cypriot letter of the same year is more cautious; it begins by assuming that the Parker consecration was valid, and explicitly excludes intercommunion until the dogmatic union of the two Churches is attained. The Alexandrian statement of 1930 was based on the assumption that a Resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 had accepted an Anglican Declaration, satisfactory to the Orthodox, as a "genuine account" of the teaching and practice of the Anglicans.¹² The last statement before the Moscow Resolution of 1948 was issued by the Romanian Church in 1935. It was generally believed that this too, was favorable. The Romanian Synod obtained the acceptance of an Anglican Delegation to an Orthodox statement on Orders and other matters and awaited ratification from "the final authority in the Anglican Church." In the words of an Anglican historian, "The English Convocations provided the requested ratification. . ." York in 1936, and Canterbury in 1937. That the Romanian conditions had been met, and the Romanian Resolution on recognition implemented, was taken for granted among Anglicans and Orthodox until 1948. Then, in the published proceedings of the Pan-Orthodox Conference in Moscow, Bishop Antim of Bucan, a Romanian delegate on the Commission, *On the Question of the Anglican Hierarchy*, is quoted as explaining the Romanian action as "conditional." Bishop Antim reported that the Romanian

Holy Synod replied to the Archbishop of Canterbury's notation of the ratification that "it gladly accepts for information the news contained in the letter, but that it still awaits a decision on this question by the whole Anglican Church."

Was Moscow a logical continuation of preceeding negotiations? It does not appear that the 1956 Conference gave any attention to the need for "ratification" of Orthodox doctrine by "the final authority in the whole Anglican Church," which would seem to be one of the next steps required in the relations between the two churches, and it is not certain from the reports that the statements of the Orthodox during the discussion were formally offered as necessary prerequisites to reunion. The old differences on the significance of Tradition are unaltered, the Anglicans do not accept the Seven Councils; the *filioque* is still a part of the Anglican version of the Creed.

Outside of Russia the Anglican question has not been in the forefront of Orthodox thinking since the thirties and, aside from a few devoted individuals and one or two societies dedicated to better understanding, both Churches have avoided contacts beyond those in purely social and formal spheres. Among the reasons for this decline in the intensity of the symptoms of mutual attraction which appeared, at one time, to signal the verge of real union, is the continued growth and expansion of Orthodoxy in the West. In western Europe, England and America, Orthodox and Anglicans are now well acquainted in daily life and work. They invariably find themselves thrown together by common interests in the Oecumenical Movement, but the Orthodox also see quite clearly, as never before, the broad comprehensiveness of Anglicanism. The remarkable adaptability of Anglican dogma, which permits simultaneous discussion, and even intercommunion, with the Church of South India, Scandinavian Lutheranism, and the British free churches, as well as, and on the same level with, the negotiations with Orthodoxy, is discovered to be consistent with the internal life of the Anglican churches right down to the parish level. In this perspective the Orthodox find themselves confronted with a vision of living unity which has no counterpart in the tradition of their Church, and is still somewhat beyond their ultimate hopes.

The Anglican claim to be a "bridge Church" is undeniable, and may well condition the final results of the Oecumenical Movement, but Orthodoxy has always approached unity from the opposite pole. In the academic atmosphere of official conferences, perhaps with non-theological pressures in the background, the focus of attention may be narrowed to a least common denominator of agreement. When exposed to the realities of the Church in life the achievements of formal negotiation, unrelated to the whole breath and expression of two traditions, are discovered to be inadequate. Add to this the

well known fact that two or more traditions seeking common ground will begin by a renewal of interest in the full content of their respective heritages, and some understanding of the basic problems of reunion is possible.

The Russian Church was denied its proper share in Orthodox Anglican approaches for three decades after World War I. It is important that Russian Orthodoxy bring itself up to date, and this is the one outstanding value of the Moscow Conference of 1956. Of correlative value are the penetration of Russian ecclesiastical isolation by friendly foreign churchmen, and the position of this one gesture toward unity in the larger context represented by the Oecumenical Movement. However limited and unsatisfactory, or uncreative, the negotiations in Moscow may have been of themselves, and the published accounts show no startling progress, in terms of the implied objectives the ultimate results cannot but be of the greatest significance for Anglicanism and world Orthodoxy, and all of those in every Christian tradition who seek unity.

NOTES

1. Religious News Service, Foreign Service, July 13, 1955, p. 7.
2. Karmiris,
3. Neal, J. M. ed., *The Life and Times of Patrick Torrey, D.D., Bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunlune, with an Appendix on the Scottish Liturgy*. 1856. p. 238.
4. Op. et loc. cit.
5. *Birbeck and the Russian Church*, Athelstan Riley, ed., London, 1917. P. 253.
6. The English translation of the text of this report exists in two versions; in the Alcuin Club Tracts, by Barnes and Frere, London, 1917, and in the *Orthodox Catholic Review*, Vol. 1, No. 6, June, 1927, Pp. 250-271. Both editions append valuable notes. The earlier translation erroneously calls the report, "only an expression of the individual views of the authors," and the notes in both editions are much too subjective — from opposite positions. Pursuant to the Report and the Synodical orders based on it, Archbishop Tikhon reordained an Episcopal priest, provoking a storm of protest culminating in a demand in the High Church press that he be recalled to Russia. In this connection it is interesting to note the comment on the visit of the 1956 Anglican Delegation to Patriarch Tikhon's grave, quoted below.
7. The bulk of the published proceedings of the Conference are available in English translation in *Major Portions of the Proceedings of the Conference of the Heads of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches, Held in Moscow, July 1948*. Paris. YMCA Press, 1952. The text of the Resolution is on p. 239. The preliminary discussions are of great interest and include a paper by Prof. V. S. Vertogradov of the Moscow Theological Academy. The Commission which prepared for the drafting of the Resolution included the Russians, Metropolitan Benjamin, Bishop Turi, Prof. Vertogradov, and Prof. L. N. Parisky.
8. Since state churches were, and are, involved, it is not astonishing that accusations of political motivation are made by observers of Anglican Orthodox negotiations. They have been made by Anglicans, Roman Catholics and Orthodox — the Albanian delegate at the 1948 Conference declares that Anglican overtures are an expression of "English imperialism"¹ (Proceedings, p. 200). Because of his tie with Venizelos, and his concern for his people in Asia Minor, Patriarch Meletios has been the principal object of this criticism. It is undeniable that his reported utterances do not dispell the claim that he regarded all of his acts are somehow related to the solution of national and political difficulties in the eastern Mediterranean area. See his speech in the minutes of a conference held in New York, Oct. 26, 1918, between an Episcopal delegation and a group of Orthodox. Pp. 9-11.
9. See Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission Appointed by the Oecumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Canterbury for Consultation on the Points of Agreement and Difference between the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches. London, 1931, Pp. 14-15 and 16-17.

Russian Religious Philosophy

Nicholas Poltoratzky

THERE ARE several reasons which make a general survey of Russian religious philosophy timely. One of these is the demise of several of its most distinguished exponents within the last 15 years: D. S. Merezhkovsky, Father Sergei Bulgakov, N. A. Berdyaev, S. L. Frank, G. P. Fedotov, B. P. Vysheslavtsev and I. A. Il'in. Their departure from the physical scene not only put the final stamp of individuality on their separate contributions to Russian religious philosophy, but brought the framework within which they operated to sharp attention, however much they may have differed or countered each other therein.

Another reason for turning one's attention to Russian religious philosophy is the recent appearance of two major publications by V. V. Zenkovsky and N. O. Lossky. Two other major publications ought to be mentioned also in this connection—N. A. Berdyaev's *Russian Thought (Basic Problems of Russian Thought of the 19th and the Beginning of the 20th Centuries)*, published in 1946 and the posthumous work of B. P. Vysheslavtsev, *The Eternal in Russian Philosophy*. The compelling character of these works alert even the skeptic to the enduring value of Russian religious philosophy and Russian philosophy in general.

Still another reason for contemporary interest in Russian religious philosophy lies in the diatribes directed against it since 1955 by spokesmen of the official Soviet Union: *Kommunist* and *Voprosy Filosofii*. Evidently in Russian religious philosophy, the Soviet leadership senses a counter-ideological power and practical menace to Marxism. Hence, the campaign of misrepresentation, denigration and refutation ordered against it.

II. *Four Periods in the Development of Russian Religious Philosophy*

Religious philosophical thought in Russia existed, of course, prior to the reign of Peter I. Its chief preoccupation, however, was with a substantiation of the concept of Russian Orthodox tsardom. Yet, it would be incorrect to speak of it, as Berdyaev did more than once, as a phenomenon of little significance. One can certainly agree with Prof. Kartashev (see his collected volume of articles, *Orthodoxy in Life*) that this thought was not without its contribution. Nevertheless, Russian philosophical thought, foregoing the medieval scholasticism of its West European counterpart, began to take on stature only during the time of imperial Russia. Thus, Russian religious philos-

ophy, foreshadowed by Skovorda in the 18th century, and nurtured in the culture brought to high level by Pushkin's advent, came into its own in the 19th century.

Russian religious philosophy of the 19th and 20th centuries, like all products of free thought, is not of single cast. N. A. Berdyaev, in his *Russian Thought*, singled out at least four major trends in Russian religious philosophy—trends sometimes interlacing, sometimes disputing with each other. These are represented in (1) the official church theology associated with the monastic-ascetic tradition, (2) theological thought deriving from the twin concepts of freedom and community (*sobornost*), (3) Christian Platonism, Schellingian philosophy, sophiology—all concerned with the problems of cosmos, and (4) anthropologism and eschatology, which center their attention on the problems of man, history, culture, and society.

Although there is a certain element of arbitrariness for excluding the more traditionally based trends from consideration, Russian religious philosophy has come to be viewed as associated primarily with certain problems: anthropologic, eschatologic, historiosophic and, to a lesser extent, cosmologic. This Russian religious philosophy has been primarily secular. Its progenitors and exponents have been accordingly primarily secular individuals.

Four major periods in the development of Russian religious philosophy may be discerned. The first period embraces, approximately, the fourth to sixth decade of the 19th century. This period is marked by the influence of German idealism on Russian thought and is associated primarily with A. Khomiakov and I. Kirievsky—men who laid the basis of contemporary Russian religious philosophy and imparted its programmatic outline to it.

The second period coincides in the main, with the last quarter of the 19th century. Here stands its most important figure—V. Solov'ev, along with Dostoevsky, L. Toystoy, K. Leont'ev, N. Fedorov, and others. It was during this time that V. Solov'ev developed his philosophic system—first in the history of Russian thought.

The third period, while it takes in the end of the 19th century, is associated mostly with the prerevolutionary years of the 20th century, which have been rightly designated by many as years of a Russian renaissance. Many names glitter here: the brothers S. N. and E. N. Trubetskoy, V. V. Rozanov, D. S. Merezhkovsky, Viacheslav Ivanov, Lev Shestov, S. N. Bulgakov, N. B. Berdyaev, P. B. Struve, S. L. Frank, S. A. Askol'dov-Alexceev, N. O. Lossky, P. I. Novogorodtsev, P. A. Florensky, V. A. Ternaftsev, V. F. Ern and others.

This is the time when two famous collected volumes, *Problems of Idealism* and *Landmarks* saw the light of day, when religio-philosophical societies flourished in Petersburg, Moscow, and Kiev, when the "spiritual battle", in

materialist *Weltanschauung* of many of the Russian intelligentsia. This is the words of Father Sergei Bulgakov, was fought against the godless and the time when many a religio-philosophical system was being planned, sketched and in the process of development.

The fourth period is the period of emigration, beginning after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, which introduced new motives and criteria into Russian consciousness. Some religious philosophers left Russian during the civil war or immediately after its end, such were P. B. Struve, Prince S. N. Trubetskoy, L. I. Shestov, N. S. Arseniev, V. V. Zen'kovsky, N. N. Alexseev and D. S. Merezhkovsky. In 1922, others were exiled abroad by the Soviet regime, as an ideological alien element. These were N. A. Berdyaev, S. L. Frank, N. O. Lossky, Rev. Sergei Bulgakov, I. A. Il'in, B. P. Vysheslavtev, J. P. Karsavin and G. P. Fedotov. Thus, with few exceptions, (Rev. P. Florensky and V. A. Ternavtsev died in Soviet Russia, S. A. Askol'dov left the USSR during the German-Soviet war and died at the end of it in Germany), almost all the most prominent representatives of Russian religious philosophy found themselves in the emigration.

Their philosophical creativity, enriched by the spiritual experience of the revolution, burst into new blossom in the emigration. Many of their works were translated into foreign languages. The greatest fame in this fell to the lot of N. A. Berdyaev, who was also the editor of a Russian religio-philosophical journal *The Path*, published in Paris. The years of emigration are a period of the completion of many religio-philosophical systems, a period of the final molding of Russian religious philosophy as a special school of philosophical thought and, at the same time, a period of the gradual emergence of Russian religious philosophy into the world scene.

II. *The Tasks and Problems of Russian Religious Philosophy*

As agreed upon by Rev. V. Zen'kovsky, N. O. Lossky, N. A. Berdyaev and other authors, Russian religious philosophers, beginning with Khomiakov in particular, proceeded from the thought that Orthodoxy signifies a different perception and understanding of Christianity from Catholicism and Protestantism. Therefore, on the basis of it and in the light of it, a new approach to the basic problems of culture and life can be found; a new world-view can be constructed. In a somewhat extreme form, N. O. Lossky expressed this in the following words (*V. Solov'ev and His Successors in Russian Religious Philosophy*): "The basic task of Russian religio-philosophical literature is the building of an Orthodox Christian worldview, revealing the rich content and vital effectiveness of the main dogma of Christianity, which in the minds of many have been transformed into lifeless formulae, cut off from life and

world-outlook." Thus, it was a question of constructing an operative and complete worldview, all the planes of which—religious, philosophical, cultural, political, social and even economic (as in S. N. Bulgakov and P. B. Struve)—mutually overlapped. As a result, Russian religious philosophy embraced not only the basic problems of spiritual culture, but also the main problems of socio-political life.

The "all-embracingness" of Russian religious philosophy may be illustrated by the following list of certain of its key themes and problems:

The problem of freedom: Freedom and necessity.

Sobornost (as distinguished from authoritarianism and individualism).

Ontologism (as opposed to dualism of culture and way of life): Ontological realism (opposed also to abstract idealism).

Religious cosmologism (expectation of the clarification and transformation of the world).

Humanism and its crisis. Religious anthropologism (as opposed to godless humanism).

The doctrine of Godmanhood (conclusion from Chalcedon dogma).

The doctrine of God's Kingdom. Eschatology.

The problem of death and immortality. The problem of evil and suffering. The problem of ethics. The quest for truth and the meaning of life.

The criticism of empiricism, rationalism, and criticism.

Knowledge and faith. Knowing with an undivided spirit. Wholeness of spirit.

The problem of creativity. The religious comprehension and justification of culture. Culture and civilization. Nihilism.

The problem of technology. Technology and progress. The building of a Christian-Orthodox culture.

The meaning of history. Personality and the masses.

The "middle class" and "bourgeois" ways.

Social truth and the social question.

Socialism and capitalism. Marxism and communism.

The problem of revolution, social and spiritual. Revolution as a religious problem.

Liberalism and democracy.

Anarchism and despotism. The problem of power.

Theocracy. The problem of the Christian state.

Orthodoxy and the Russian historical process. Orthodoxy and the Russian soul. Orthodoxy and Russian culture. The Church and life.

Russian defects and the overcoming of them. The Church schism. The reform of Peter the Great. The lack of organic bond between the Church

hierarchy and Church people, between the regime and society, between the intelligentsia and the people (lack of a basic reason for the Russian cultural stratum).

The course of Russia and the Russian people in the world. Russia and Europe, East and West, Slavophilism and Westernism.

This list of themes could be broadened considerably and greatly developed. One could also try to generalize them. In particular Berdyaev made an attempt at this by dividing the themes according to centuries, and in his *Russian Thought* he defined the theme of the 19th century as a "wild striving toward the latest fruits of world civilization, toward socialism, and along with this, a profound and sharp consciousness of the emptiness, deformity, soullessness, and philistinism of all the fruits of world progress, revolution, civilization and so forth". Here is the definition of the basic theme of Russian thought of the beginning of the 20th century, this is the "theme of the divine cosmos and of cosmic transformation, of the energies of the creator in his works, the theme of the divine in man, of the creative calling of man, the meaning of culture, the eschatological theme, the theme of the philosophy of history". Russian religious philosophy really embraced all the basic questions of culture and life.

III. *Attitude toward Russian Religious Philosophy*

How is one to regard a philosophy which is so close to life? What is the significance of Russian religious philosophy? Above all, what was the attitude toward it formerly and what is the attitude at present?

It must be emphasized that this philosophy is a characteristic Russian phenomenon. In other countries, there have also existed isolated religious thinkers, but these thinkers have never constituted a whole school of free non-dogmatic philosophical thought, which could dominate over all other philosophical currents, as was the case in Russia.

However, even in Russia, this philosophical current, (which included the majority of the best, the most profound and original Russian mind) encountered until now a cautious and at times hostile attitude toward itself.

Hostility was evidenced, above all, by the representatives of the positivist and materialist worldview, which was formed in the second half of the 19th century. The latter were already extremely repelled by idealism on the German model; religious philosophy was for them the limit in mental obscurantism. For the Soviet period of Russian history, the tone was set by Lenin. Reducing all currents, whether bound or not with Russian religious philosophy, to a common denominator, Lenin wrote, "God-seeking is distinguished from God-building, or God-constructing, or God-creating, etc., not one wit more

than a yellow devil is distinguished from a blue devil". All this was for Lenin nothing but "intellectual alcrophilism". From that time on, Soviet philosophers debated with Russian religious philosophers in one of two ways, either by covering up through silence or by vilification.

Hostility toward Russian religious philosophy was evidenced however not only by representatives of the positivistic and materialistic school but by representatives of so-called pure or academic philosophy as well. Representatives of various forms of German idealism and criticism, although they did not consider Russian religious philosophy the maid-servant of theology, nevertheless frequently denied its philosophical worth. It is curious, incidently, to note that some representatives of "pure" philosophy subsequently became themselves religious philosophers. Such was F. A. Stepun. There are in addition, a number of philosophers of the academic type, such as the Trubetskoi brothers, N. O. Lossky and S. L. Frank. These men, while simultaneously academic and religious philosophers, tended more and more to the latter.

The strongest objections, against Russian religious philosophy were raised not by atheistic or religiously neutral circles, but by certain official church circles and secular writers connected with these circles.

It has long been noted that Russian Orthodoxy is not a uniform, single faceted phenomenon. The type of Russian sainthood represented by Nil Sorasky and the type of sainthood represented by Iosif Volotsky are quite different. Also completely original is the type of Russian sainthood represented by Seraphim Sarovsky. It is possible to establish a whole series of other differences. Undoubtedly, there are several currents in Russian Orthodoxy. Here you have the followers of the monastic ascetic trend, of course the most traditional and perpetual, not in frequently coming out against Russian religious philosophy, which is primarily bound with the anthropocentric and cosmological currents in Orthodoxy.

In the 19th century, the main spokesman of attacks upon the "sentimental, rosy Christianity" of Khomiakov, Dostoevsky and Tolstoi was Konstantin Leont'ev. In the beginning of the 20th century, the role of K. Leont'ev was taken over by P. A. Florensky, who subsequently became a priest. This continues right up to our times, now not only with regard to Khomiakov, V. Solv'ev, Tolstoi, and Dostoevsky, but also the leaders of the Russian religious-philosophical renaissance of the beginning and first half of the 20th century.

Of what is Russian religious philosophy accused? Above all, of modernism and unorthodoxy, and in passing, of unoriginality. A brilliant reply, as it seems to us, to this accusation was made by one of the chief creators of contemporary Russian religious philosophy, N. A. Beryaev.

"With no less a basis than Russian religious thought" wrote Berdyaev in

his article, *On the Character of Russian Religious Thought of the 19th Century*, "One could accuse Greek patristics of an insufficiently Orthodox and Christian character". As is known, such an accusation was really made, such liberal protestant historians of the dogmas like Harnack accuse the Greek teachers of the Church, who worked out the dogmatics, of the Hellenization of Christianity, of the subordination of the Gospel and Christian revelation to Hellenistic philosophy. The Hellenistic philosophy, Platonism, proved to be the "source of Christian philosophy and Christian theology". This was in the Christian East.

The same thing took place in the Christian West, where St. Thomas Aquinas "Christened" the heathen Aristotle and "utilized to such an extent the categories of Aristotelian philosophy for the development of Catholic theology and metaphysics that Catholic dogmatics appeared coalesced with Aristotelianism".

There is, therefore, nothing anti-Christian in the fact that Hegel and Schelling had for Russian religio-philosophical thought the same meaning that Plato had for the patristics and Aristotle for scholasticism. For both Aristotle and Plato, with whose help Catholicism and Greek patristics took form, were "no more, nor less Christian than Schelling and Hegel".

Thus, Russian religious thought of the 19th century "did something analogous to that which the Greek teachers of the Church did in their time, Plato and neoplatonism, for the defense and disclosure of the Christian truth given in revelation; so did the Russian religious thinkers using the highest philosophy of the time, Schelling and German idealism".

By this the accusation of modernism is overthrown. For if Russian religious philosophy is modernism, then Greek patristics, which adapted platonism to Christianity and western scholasticism, which adapted Aristotelianism to Christianity were also modernism.

As far as unoriginality is concerned, it must be said that the Russian religious thinkers did not simply transpose the German idealists and mystics into Russian, but creatively transformed and transcended them (Hegel's *Aughebug*) going from idealism to realism. The Russian religious philosophy created by them is, in this sense, a completely special phenomenon in the history of human thought.

IV. *Positive and Negative Characteristics of Russian Religious Philosophy*

After this attempt at an "integral" defense of Russian religious philosophy, it is necessary also to make a certain "differentiation", again, unavoidably only a summary. It is necessary, albeit in general outline, to separately note the positive characteristics of Russian religious philosophy and its defects. This

means to return partially to the question of the problematics of Russian religious philosophy.

Those general traits by which Rev. V. V. Zen'kovsky, in the first volume of his *History* characterizes Russian philosophy in general, entirely apply to Russian religious philosophy in particular. Its chief characteristic is *anthropocentrism*, the exclusive concern with the theme of man, his fate, and problematics. This leads to the domination of the *moral* orientation, in which lies "one of the most effective and creative sources of Russian philosophizing". A special attention to the social problem, and also to the problems of *historiosophy* is joined to this.

In the anthropocentrism of Russian thought, writes Rev. V. V. Zen'kovsky, "there is one very deep *motif*, the impossibility of 'separating' the theoretical from the practical sphere. In the inseparability of theory and practice abstract thought and life, is contained, actually, one of the main inspirations of Russian philosophical thought". This characteristic of Russian thought was indicated by still another of its historians, N. O. Lossky. "At first glance", he wrote, "it may seem that the problems investigated by Russian religious philosophy have a purely *theoretical* interest and are deprived of all practical meaning. However, this is not true. Every detail of religious metaphysics entails practical consequences and is elaborated namely with a view of its practical significance."

The anthropocentrism of Russian religious thought, its moral attitude, social orientation and historiosophic nature, as well as its theoretico-practical completeness, were pierced through with an unusual freedom of spirit. The very doctrine of freedom, as a basis of Christianity, was bound with the doctrine of sobornost and ontologism.

In this Russian anthropocentric and historiosophic thought, in the words of Berdyaev, "the experiment was made of a Christian comprehension of the processes of modern history. *In it the thought of the Christian East makes its answer to the thought of the Christian West.*" In this lies the main and continuing characteristic and merit of Russian religious philosophy that its message is not of restricted interest, of interest only to Russian philosophy, but has beyond this, a message for philosophy in general.

Many shortcomings of Russian religious philosophy are connected with its virtues.

This philosophy was born outside of the Russian philosophical tradition. Such a tradition did not even exist; it was first created by Russian religious philosophy itself. If one adds to this fact, noted by others previously, that the Russian cultured stratum at that time was already turned either toward the

and people, then rootlessness and alienated character of certain representatives of Russian religious philosophy will become understandable.

Rootless Russian thought was at the same time also Utopian thought. It was possessed by "either the utopia of the ideal autocratic monarchy or the utopia of the ideal socialistic and anarchistic system" (Beryaev). And occasionally a peculiarity of Russian religious thought was, if not *nihilism* and *anarchism*, then uncompromising *maximalism*. Instead of gradual historic, cultural, social, and political work, it demanded a radical reorganization of society and the world.

In the beginning of the 20th century, still another danger was defined. The revolutionary or reformist movement in the religio-philosophical sphere, developing under the symbol of the so-called new religious consciousness, and having created a utopia of new religious statement society, built its program "*in conscious opposition of itself to historical Christianity*" (Rev. V. V. Zen'kovsky).

All these peculiarities of Russian religious philosophy, its merits and shortcomings, are not encountered in all Russian religious thinkers of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. When they are encountered, it is to varying degrees and sometimes in the most unexpected combinations. But we are here concerned with the general characteristics of Russian religious philosophy and not with an analysis of the work of its individual representatives. An "antinomic" judgement about it—and its "antinomic" evaluation—are, therefore, wholly unavoidable.

V. *Russian Religious Philosophy and Contemporary Times*

Despite undoubted orientation to the past and future, Russian religio-philosophic thought is at the same time to a considerable degree *oriented to the present*. It would be an error to consider only the present day as the present. The present is a whole historical period—the period of the World Wars, of socio-economic and political revolutions, of unprecedented progress in science and technology. For Russia and the Russians, this period began not later than the moment of the first Russian Revolution of 1905, and perhaps, even considerably earlier.

Of what do the basic problems of contemporary times consist, what questions does the present put before our conscience? Above all, the following:

The problem of science and technology. Man and the atomic age.

The problem of progress, civilization and culture. The secularization of culture.

The problem of one world.

Russia and America, the USSR and the USA. Russia and Asia. Russia and Europe. Peace and war—cold and hot. Coexistence.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 and the Soviet regime. The Third Rome and the Third International.

The social question. Socialism and Communism, Marxism.

Nationalism. National-socialism. Fascism.

The problem of freedom and coercion. Totalitarianism.

Liberalism and colonialism. The involvement of backward and colonial peoples into the crucible of world history.

Faith and knowledge. The fate of religion and the Church. Ecumenism.

Though incomplete, it is sufficient to compare this list of themes and problems of contemporary times with the list of basic problems of Russian religious philosophy given above, to be convinced that these two lists overlap. The problems of contemporary times are almost without exception part of the group of problems which occupied and continue to occupy Russian religio-philosophic thought. This means that we may find the answers to very many of these questions in Russian religious philosophy—or, at any rate, the formulation of those questions—which torment the conscience of contemporary people.

In nothing else, perhaps, is the closeness of Russian religious philosophy to contemporary times so strongly manifested, as in the formulation and treatment of the problems of socialism and Marxism. In addition to the social orientation already inherent in Russian thought, an even greater significance was given here by the fact that the main leaders of the early 20th century Russian religio-philosophical renaissance were people who had gone from the Marxist camp first to idealism and then to religious philosophy. These were P. B. Struve, S. N. Bulgakov, N. A. Berdyaev, S. L. Frank, and others. They went through a period of enthusiasm for socialism and Marxism, knew these thoroughly, and saw all their shortcomings and dangers. Their criticism of socialism and Marxism has, therefore, special significance.

Of the criticism of Marxism made by these philosophers, the greatest circulation in the Western world was had by Berdyaev. The fury with which certain Soviet "hacks" (Zaslavsky, *Voprosy Filosofiy*, No. 4, 1953) sputter against Berdyaev, as the inspirer of many Western European and American critics of Marxism, is therefore, wholly understandable. Zaslavsky and others are zealously continuing the struggle against the "devil", begun and bequeathed by Lenin.

Within two years after the death of Stalin, a certain change, as we noted in the beginning, was however, marked in the attitude of official Soviet philosophy toward the Russian religious philosophers. In the lead article of

Voprosy Filosofy, No. 3, 1955, it was said that the authors of books abroad on the history of Russian philosophy hold to "idealistic views"; Soviet historians of philosophy, however, according to the admission of the article, "until now have not properly replied to all these falsifying constructions". A special article by N. G. Tarakanov was devoted to this latter task in the same number of the journal. His article is entitled "Falsifiers of the History or Russian Philosophical Thought" and is directed against the books on the history of Russian philosophy by Rev. V. V. Zen'kovsky and N. O. Lossky. The central theoretical organ of the Communist Party, *Kommunist*, set the same task for itself (No. 10, 1955). In an article under the triple authorship of the same N. Tarakanov, V. Malinin and I. Shchipanov, "Against Contemporary Bourgeois Falsifiers of the History of Russian Philosophy", the battlefield is already broader. Besides N. O. Lossky and Rev. V. V. Zen'kovsky, three foreign authors of books on the history of Russian thought—R. Heyer, S. Tompkins, and B. Schulze, are under fire.

This attack by Soviet philosophers in 1955 upon Russian emigres and foreigners—the authors of books on the history of Russian thought, was not, however, something fortuitous and episodic. In the last year, 1956, there appeared a second volume (the first appeared in 1955) of the collective work of a series of Soviet philosophers, *Essay on the History of Philosophical and Socio-Political Thought of People of the USSR*. A considerable portion of the last chapter of this work is also devoted to rejoinders to still the same "White emigres and bourgeois reactionaries" to whom reference was made in 1955. Nevertheless, even this new attack seems still insufficient to many Soviet philosophers. And a certain F. T., in the latest number of *Voprosy Filosofy* for 1956, expressing the opinion of others as well, writes that "one of the great shortcomings" of the *Essays* is the fact that they are "feebly directed" against that which is called by Soviet philosophers "bourgeois falsifications of the history of philosophical and socio-political thought of the peoples of the USSR". Consequently, the attack upon, in essence, still only a defensive action against, such Russian religious philosopher-historians as N. O. Lossky, V. V. Zen'kovsky, N. A. Berdyaev, and foreign authors, sharing the "idealistic" conception of the history of Russian thought, will be continued even further.

"The study and criticism of contemporary foreign idealistic philosophy must become an integral part of all branches of our science—both dialectical materialism and historical materialism, ethics and esthetics", declared the director of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, P. N. Fedoseev, at an all-Union coordinating conference of Soviet philosophers in June of last year. It is clear from Fedoseev's paper that we

are to be spectators of an attack opened up against idealism on the whole front of Soviet philosophy. As we already know from *Voprosy Filosofiy* for 1955, the Soviet ideological leadership is much disturbed by the fact that idealism—that is, Russian religious philosophy, above all—has been only repudiated but not refuted by Soviet philosophers.

Thus, Russian religious philosophy (called in the *Essays* sometimes “religio-idealistic”, sometimes “religio-mystic” philosophy) now acquires a completely new significance in addition to its abstract and purely philosophical one. This is as an arsenal of ideas in the struggle against Marxist communist ideology, dialectical and historical materialism.

This significance is connected with yet another factor. As a result of the Revolution of 1917, there are only two philosophies now in the Russian language: Marxist philosophy—“Diamat” and “Histmat”—in the Soviet Union, and in Russian religious philosophy in the emigration. *There are no others.* The representatives of “pure” philosophy—with rare isolated exceptions, who do not change the general picture—have either departed from life or have themselves gone over to religious philosophy.

The representative personnel of Russian religious philosophy during the last years, has, it is true, thinned out drastically. But many religious thinkers are alive and are successfully continuing their philosophical work. We shall name the patriarchs of contemporary Russian philosophy, N. O. Lossky, F. A. Stegun, Rev. V. V. Zen'kovsky, N. S. Arsen'ev, Rev. G. V. Florovsky, L. A. Zander, V. N. Lossky, V. N. Il'in, Bishop Ioann (Shakhovskoi), and others. It is also true that the matter of finding successors and continuers of the traditions of Russian religious philosophy among the youth is far from promising. In the Soviet Union, the youth is deprived of the possibility of getting into free religio-philosophical work. In the emigration, on the other hand, the general conditions of material existence naturally pushed youth into studying more in the fields of science and technology at the universities than in the humanities. Recently, from among the ranks of the young generation, only S. A. Levitsky has come forth in earnest—and a few of the charges of the Paris Orthodox Theological Institute. A few persons are now studying in the universities of Western Europe and America. All of them are followers or continuers of Russian religious philosophy. One can regard this fact variously, but the fact itself leaves no doubt that the so-called pure—secularized—philosophy has almost no successors and continuers in Russian circles. On the other hand, hundreds of juvenile Marxist-philosophers turned out under the heel of Communism, represent quantity which is scarcely fated to turn into quality.

But at present, if the matter of successors to Russian religious philosophy

leaves much to be desired, an enormous consolation lies in the results already attained by this philosophy. Here is the official genealogy of Russian materialism, taken over by Soviet Marxism, as it appears to the authors in *Kommunist*, *Voprosy Filosofy*, and other Soviet publications: Lomonosov, Radishchev, certain Decembrists, Belinsky, Gertsen, Chernyshevsky, Pisarev, Dobroliubov, Lenin, Stalin and Zhdanov. We will not even dispute the rightness of including Lomonosov and Gertsen in this series. We shall proceed directly to the genealogy of Russian religious philosophy. These are: Khomiakov, Ivan Kireevskii, Chaadaev, V. Solov'ev, Tolstoi, Dostoevsky, K. Leont'ev, N. Fedorov, Mesmelov, Rozanov, Merezhkovsky, the Trubetskoi brothers, L. Shestov, Berdyaev, Peter Struve, Father S. Bulgakov, S. Frank, N. Lossky, I. Il'in, Father P. Flornesky, L. Karasavin, Fedotov, Vysheslavtsev, F. Stepun, N. S. Arsen'ev, Father V. Zen'kovsky, Father G. Florovsky and others.

And if one turns only to that period of contemporary times beginning from the moment of the Bolsheviks' seizure of power in Russia in 1917, we will be even more convinced of the worth of Russian religious philosophy. In the space of a little over thirty years of their sojourn in the emigration, the Russian religious thinkers enriched philosophy with a whole series of first-rate philosophical works and systems. On the whole, the best works of Rev. S. Bulgakov, N. A. Berdyaev, S. L. Frank, N. O. Lossky and others were created in the emigration. These were works—and philosophical systems—or a great, synthesizing conception. Soviet Marxist philosophy, on the other hand, produced nothing really worthwhile or new during this time. According to the happy definition of S. P. Vysheslavtsev, Marxism "is still stamping in the traces of its thesis and is completely unable to go over to the antithesis".

In virtue of all this, we may boldly affirm that Marxist philosophy has no future. It has only a police enforced present. The future belongs to Russian religious philosophy.

N. Poltoratzky

Some Remarks on Christian-Muslim Relations in the Balkans and Anatolia

Harry J. Psomiades*

PRIOR to the Twentieth Century—a century extremely disastrous to racial and religious minorities—the Balkan peninsula could boast of Turkish (Gagauz) speaking Christians and Greek (Cretan), Albanian, Bulgarian (Pomak), Rumanian (Meglen) and Serbo-Croatian (Bosniak) speaking Muslims. In addition, there were large numbers of Turkic Muslim settlements in Macedonia, Thrace, eastern Rumelia (Bulgaria) and the Dobrudja; these areas, incidently, had the largest mixture of races and were the foci of many national disputes in modern times.¹ Eastern Orthodoxy was, of course, the predominant religion in the kaleidoscopic peninsula.

The heterogeneous Balkan peninsula stands in sharp contrast to the relatively homogeneous Anatolian peninsula with which it has shared, for so many centuries, a geographic, political and social unity. As the connecting link between three continents, both peninsulae became the home of strange intermixtures of national, racial and religious groups tossed about by the ebb and flow of military, religious and demographic conquests. However, after several hundred years of Turkish domination, there emerged a wide contrast between them. How was it that the Turks failed in consolidating the Balkans but succeeded in unifying Anatolia? The answers to this question will be the primary consideration of this paper.

Muslim-Christian Relations in Anatolia

a. *The March Community*

Faud Koprulu and Paul Wittek have made a special study of the cultural aspects of Byzantine-Muslim relations.² According to these scholars, in the course of centuries of indecisive border conflicts between Muslim raiding parties and Byzantine border patrols, there grew along the Byzantine-Islamic border, a frontier society of Islamic *ghazzis* and Greek *akritoi*.

The pioneer society of the marches, despite the antagonism of the religions, which were for the most part splintered into a multiple of sects, intensified the cultural exchange between Islam and Christianity and was the basis of

* Mr. Psomiades is a graduate student at Columbia University where he is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Public Law and Government. Although the research in which this article is based was made possible by funds granted by the Ford Foundation, the Foundation is not to be understood as approving by virtue of its grant any of the statements or views expressed therein.

a steady assimilation process. The morality of the marches was neither Christian nor Muslim but a mixture of both. Eastern Anatolia became in fact a no-man's land, where heresies flourished. Manichaeans, Massalians, Paulicians, Monophysites, Neo-platonists³ and others were among the Christian heresies and schisms of the frontier while Shi'ite and Sufi doctrines flourished among the Muslims. Loyalties were local and the independence of the tribal clan or border community was assured by the constant threat to go over to the enemy if the pressure from the central government grew uncomfortable. The Muslim breakthrough at Manzikert in 1071 was partly due to the withdrawal of the schismatic Armenians—for centuries Byzantium's first line of defense in the East—from the Byzantine camp because of religious persecution.

There were defections to the enemy by the Byzantine *akritoi* and mercenary armies—which included a large number of Turkic peoples. There were also defections to the Greeks; usually the result of some local quarrel over the *ghazzis*. The transition was not a difficult one.⁴

b. *The early Turkish migrations and the Sultanate of Konya*

After the Muslims conquest of Khorasan and Transoxania, large Turkic nomadic groups became Warriors of the Faith and turned to non-Muslim areas; namely, the Byzantine and Indian frontiers. Religious zeal, the lure of booty and the military weakness of a relatively prosperous Anatolia were incentives for increased *ghazzi* activity along the Byzantine border. The penetration of large numbers of Muslim Turks into Anatolia, thus, began in the Eleventh Century. Very soon, thereafter, in the central and eastern portions of Anatolia and especially in the central plateau area, the Turkish race became the dominant group. The religious domination of Islam in these areas was aided by the military power of the *ghazzis* and the Turkish nomads, whose destruction of life and property soon led many Byzantines to abandon their lands and homes; especially in the open plateau areas which were prime targets of the nomads. The spread of Islam was also aided by the fanaticism of the religious holy men who accompanied the nomadic groups from Central Asia and the *akhis*—religious trade guilds, which sought alongside the extension of trade, the propagation and growth of Islam.

Following the battle of Manzikert, in eastern Anatolia, the Turkish nomads under the exiled Seljuk prince Suleyman, pushed their way to Nicaea in western Anatolia, which they occupied in 1081. The city, however, and most of western Anatolia was soon recovered by the Byzantines with the aid of the First Crusade.

After a hundred years of nomadic penetration in Anatolia, the Seljuks under Mas'ud became permanent sedentary settlers with their center at

Konya. As such, they sought to protect the land and its inhabitants from the depredations of other nomads. The plain between Konya and Kayseri, very fertile under irrigation, with a Greek population still uninfluenced by the frontier community, provided the economic base of the first permanent Islamic state in Anatolia.⁵ In the Twelfth Century the Sultanate of Rum at Konya became the most powerful state in Anatolia. This was partly due to the decline of the great Seljukide Empire (1038-1150) following the rule of Malikshah (1072-91). The establishment of the Sultanate of Rum marked the decline of the *ghazzi* movement and brought an end to the mass penetration of Turkish nomads into those areas left to Byzantium in Anatolia. The lands of the Konya rulers separated Byzantium from the nomadic Turkic tribes in the East.

In the Thirteenth Century, the relations between the Seljuks of Konya and Byzantium were most cordial. Both states were primarily concerned with retaining the *status quo* and often joined ranks for their common defense.⁶ A Comnenus led a Seljuk attack on Lesser Armenia and Seljuk arms aided the Byzantine recapture of Constantinople.

Assimilation and a state of friendly intercourse were encouraged. Pachymeres (1242-1310) reported that the Patriarch Arsenius was broad minded enough to allow the Seljuk Sultan to bathe in a bath belonging to the Church, and to order a monk to administer the Sacrament to the children of the Sultan.⁷ Greek mathematicians and philosophers were sought for by the Seljuks of Konya, and several of the Seljuk princes were sent to the Imperial City for their education. Renewed attention was paid to Byzantine models by Seljuk architects and decorators.⁸ The Byzantines in turn appreciated the Turks. Anna Comnena, the greatest woman historian of Byzantium, considered the Turks more humane than the Crusaders and preferred Turkish mercenaries of barbarian Franks.⁹ As early as the Eleventh Century, she represented the Turks as very ready to be bribed into a change of religion.¹⁰ By the close of the Thirteenth Century, Christian proselytizers were having many successes amongst the Seljuks of Konya and even among their princely families where mixed marriages occurred frequently.¹¹

Part of the vitality of Byzantine culture in the critical Thirteenth Century was illustrated in the voluntary conversion of the Gagauz Turks who are today to be found in the Dobrudja and most of all in Bessarabia, were descendent from the Karakalpak Turks.¹² It was assumed that the Gagauz were originally pagan Turks Christianized by the Russians in the great northern Steppeand. The true identity of these people was finally brought to light by the research of T. Kowalski and P. Wittek.¹³ Kowalski's analysis of the Gagauz language established it to be essentially a southern Turkish language very closely related to Ottoman Turkish. Since no conversions were made to

Christianity during the Ottoman period, it was established that the conversion of the Gagauz took place prior to the Ottoman period, i.e. before the end of the Fourteenth Century. Wittek worked on an historical compilation composed in Turkish by a certain Yazijioghlu Ali during the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Murad II (1421-51). The work was primarily a translation of Ibn Bibi's history of the Seljuks of Rum which was finished in 1281.

This historical record indicated that Michael VIII Palaeologos, having captured Constantinople from the Franks in 1261, was being aided in his Balkan campaigns by Seljuk troops. These troops had joined their Sultan, Izzeddin Kaikaus II, then in exile at the Byzantine Court. For their services, they were allowed to settle with their families in the strategic Dobrudja area which was the main route of invasion from the North. In time, these loyal subjects of the Emperor voluntarily converted to Christianity.

c. *The religious orders*

Constant military operations and political and economic chaos strongly influenced the religious climate of opinion in Anatolia. The wars reminded one of the transitoriness of human life and there was a general desire by both Christians and Muslims to seek escape in a religious mysticism that was other worldly. We have seen that the border areas, especially, were a foci of Sufism and heterodox beliefs.

Without a doubt the mystical movements of the Thirteenth Century played a salient role in the Islamization process in Anatolia. Of the twelve mystical sects founded before the Ottoman period, two, the Bektashi and the Mevlevi, exerted the greatest influence.

The Bektashi order developed out of the common life of the people. From the customs and practices which came originally from the ethnical life of the various peoples who mingled together on the frontiers in the Thirteenth Century, the Bektashi order developed an eclectic system of faith and practice.¹⁴ It catered alike for "the educated and the ignorant, providing for the former a philosophical standpoint, for the latter a full measure of mystery and superstition, and for all alike a convenient compromise and a basic mutual toleration."¹⁵

The Mevlevi order, on the other hand, grew up chiefly in the urban centers, as aristocratic, intellectual fraternities, especially attracting members from the upper classes on grounds largely of aesthetic appeal. The founder of the order was the greatest mystic poet of Islam, Jalal-ad-Din Rumi. In 1226, as a protracted wanderer from Bokhara, in central Asia, he found a patron in the Seljuk prince Ala-ad-Din Kaykobad at Konya. There he met the mystic Shams-ad-Din Tazrizi, who won him over entirely to a life of contemplation, and in whose name he published his diwan. His chief work, the *Mesnevi*, de-

scribes in highly poetic style, the search for a pantheistic dissolution of the ego, and reflects in very illuminating language, the basic ideas of mysticism. Among his followers the work was valued almost as high as the Qur'an, and for centuries determined the intellectual outlook of the best elements of the Ottoman Empire.¹⁶

The Dervish orders believed that their founders and saints had achieved contact with the spiritual world. Each of these persons, they believed, had shown their disciples the way of initiation they themselves travelled. Thus in the course of time a great many ways (*Tariqat*) were laid down for those seeking to be united with God. The Dervishes were not therefore dogmatic as to the way to salvation. They were sympathetic to both Christians and Muslims. The good Dervish made no distinction in his conduct between Muslims and non-Muslims, and he welcomed non-Muslims to be admitted to his order.¹⁷

The Bektashi, especially, were attractive to new and would-be converts as well as more tolerant of alien thought. The proletarian character of their organization, and the ideal of voluntary poverty made a deep impression on the poor masses.¹⁸ The conversion of illiterate Christians, always aided by material attraction, became rather easy under this accommodating form of Islam.

The principal instrument with which the Orders made considerable conversions was the worship of saints. The vital and positive religion of the Anatolian Christians was bound up with the cult of the saints and demanded concrete objects of worship, especially graves and relics, and above all miracles to sustain the faith.¹⁹ Both Orders and especially the Bektashi, set about monopolizing the various holy shrines and identifying the Christian shrines and saints with theirs. They drew Christians to their shrines by spreading rumors that their locations had special significance for Christians. The more ignorant the population concerned, the further they pressed their identifications. The Kizilbash Kurds, closely related to the Bektashi, for example, equated Ali with Christ, the twelve Imams, to the twelve Apostles, and Hasan and Husain to SS Peter and Paul.²⁰

Hasluck found a great deal of evidence which suggests that the veneration of the Muslims of Konya for Christian holy places was intentionally favored by the Mevlevi, as providing a cult which Muslim and Christian might share on equal terms. He found four large sanctuaries in Konya which might be visited without violence of conscience by Christians and Muslims alike.²¹ S. Amphilocheous at Konya in the Fifteenth Century was a point of pilgrimage for both religions. The relations between the monastery of S. Chariton and the *tekke* of the Mevlevi were most cordial. In Efaki's *Act of the Adepts*

which centered in the personality of Jalal-ad-Din Rumi, we find several tales illustrating the success of the Mevlevi propaganda among Christians.²²

The Greek religious leaders were also very active. Christian churches adopted fictitious Bektashi traditions and received Bektashi pilgrims, in the same manner that Bektashi *tekkes* adopted fictitious Christian legends and received Christian pilgrims.²³ Muslims who would never have suffered to be called *gavur* (infidel) did not hesitate of turn for help to Christian monks.²⁴

The question of the degree of Islamization among the early Turkic invaders of Anatolia is debatable. Those tribes who overran Anatolia after Manzikert had been in Persia for some time and were under strong Shi'ite and Persian influence. Some of the tribes came directly from central Asia with very loose Islamic ties. (The first Turkish house to embrace Islam were the Karakhanids in the beginning of the Tenth Century.) Orthodox Islam sat lightly on the Seljuk rulers of Konya. Babinger was led to believe that they were heretical, while Koprulu denies this but admits that Shi'ite doctrines exerted a strong influence upon them.²⁵ Von Grunebaum believes that the Seljuk government supported the cult of the saints and Shi'ite doctrines, only as a half-hearted political measure, in attempts at consolidating Sunni Orthodoxy.²⁶

After prolonged attempts at proselytizing, by both religions, Christianity and Islam began to accept the doctrine of peaceful coexistence. The *Ghazzis* and the holymen accompanying the Turkish nomads did demand that people accept the Muslim tag but were extremely tolerant as to their form of worship. They were satisfied with persons practicing their former religion as long as they nominally called themselves Muslims. The situation with the Sultanate of Konya was somewhat different. The emphasis was on peaceful penetration. The Sultans were primarily concerned with the preservation of their state and the well being of its citizens. Their Christian subjects were a source of wealth and strength and were allowed to retain their religion in return for their services to the state.

d. *The Turkic penetration and the Emirate of Osman*

By the middle of the Thirteenth Century, the political and religious future of Anatolia had not been decided. Western Anatolia with its large Greek population was Byzantine. Along the Black Sea littoral, the Greek Empire of Trebizond continued to flourish. In the south, the Seljuks of Konya with their large Greek population were under strong Greek influence. In the east, the new Kingdom of Lesser Armenia (1199-1375) was the northern bastion of the string of Frankish states along the Levant coast.

However, the peaceful state of affairs in Anatolia was brought to a halt in the middle of the Thirteenth Century. The Mongol invasion and the stream

of nomadic Turkic immigrants which it unleashed, broke the power of the Sultanate of Konya and reinstituted the *ghazzi* tradition. The religious *status quo* was upset in favor of Islam by the sudden influx of Turkish settlers, Muslim holymen and the growing influence of the *akhis*—religious guilds.²⁷ The Seljuk *uch beys* or frontier leaders, reinforced by the new *ghazzi* element, by the end of the century, succeeded to most of the Byzantine possessions in Anatolia. Several dozen Emirates were established. The most important of these were the Emirats of Mentsehe, Aydin, Karaman, Kastamuni, Kermian, Hamid and Sarakhan. Of these, the Emirates of Mentesehe and Aydin were initially the most important ones. They succeeded to the west and south-west portion of Anatolia and became famous as Turkish pirate states. Aided by Christian sailors—who lost their jobs because Byzantium was no longer able to maintain its fleet—they crossed into the Balkans on many piratical raids and at times they went over as allies of the Byzantine emperors.

Real power, however, soon passed to the small Emirate of Osman in the north-west corner of Anatolia. As the only Emirate to border on important Christian territory, it became by definition the only *ghazzi* state in Anatolia; thus it was able to attract the many unemployed *ghazzi* warriors, soldiers of fortune and Muslim holymen. The basis of Ottoman power was the *ghazzi* tradition. It was a state born of conflict. It had to expand or be devoured by its unemployed warriors. With the decline of Byzantine power, Ottoman expansion into the Balkans was inevitable.

Muslim-Christian Relations in the Balkans

a. *The Ottoman expansion...*

The early Ottoman experience with Christians was intimate and tolerant. The territory of the Ottomans in Anatolia contained a large Greek population and included the wealthy and famous Greek cities of Brusa, Nicaea and Nicomedia. Many of the leading families of Ottoman Bithynia were incorporated into the Ottoman ruling class and became influential soldiers and administrators in the new state.

As a *ghazzi* state with a long and successful tradition of Christian assimilation, the Ottomans plunged into the Balkans with rapid speed and success. Under Murad I (1359-1389), they defeated a coalition of Serbs and Hungarians in 1363 in Thrace. In 1371, they defeated a coalition of Byzantines and Serbs at Chirme. In this period, they were invited by King Shishman of Bulgaria to halt a Hungarian advance. The Hungarians had brought the Inquisition to the Balkans and tried to force the Orthodox Slavs into becoming Roman Catholic. The anti-Orthodox religious policy of the West and their expansionist designs in the Balkans did much to antagonize the Orthodox

Balkan peoples and encouraged their cooperation with the Ottomans. In less than fifteen years the Ottomans succeeded in isolating Constantinople and establishing themselves as the strongest power in the Balkans. The Ottoman capital was moved to Edirne (Adrianople).²⁸

Under Bayizid I (1389-1403) the Ottomans consciously began to aspire to world Empire. The brilliant military operations of the "lightening" Sultan succeeded in uniting the Balkan and Anatolian peninsulae. But in 1402, on the plains of Ankara, Bayizid met defeat at the hands of the scourge of the East, Timurlenk. Bayizid's Turkic troops deserted to the enemy, while his Christians remained a majority in the Ottoman state.

In a few years, the Ottomans once again expanded from their Balkan stronghold and under Mohammed II (1451-1481) were established as a world power. The fall of Constantinople and the establishment, there, of the new Ottoman capital marked the imperial phase of Ottoman history. By then, Christians and Muslims were evenly balanced in the Empire.

Under Bayizid II (1481-1512), Selim, the Grim, (1512-1520) and Suleyman, the Magnificent, (1520-1566), the Empire reached its Zenith. With the inclusion of the Muslim Arab world in the Ottoman Empire under Selim, the Grim, the religious balance was broken in favor of Islam.

b. *The ghazis in the Balkans*

The main forces of the early Ottoman penetration of the Balkans were composed of *ghazis*. Under their great *uch beys* like the Evrenos and Michaeloghlu (formerly important Greek families of Anatolia), they continued the *ghazis* tradition, especially in portions of Albania, Bosnia, southern Bulgaria, Macedonia and Thrace. The process of assimilation in the *ghazis* marches of the Balkans differed from that of Anatolia in two important respects. Firstly, there was no question of conversion to Christianity and secondly, the new converts to Islam maintained their own language. The rapid growth of the new state and the expansion of the Janissaries or regular army of the Sultan which began with the first Turkish penetration into the Balkans severely limited the assimilation process.

The assimilation of the early *ghazis* areas in the Balkans and their final conversion to Islam was facilitated by an important segment of the population belonging to the Bogomil sect. Persecuted by their rulers, they welcomed the Turks. Their religious doctrines were very simplified and not too far removed from those of Islam. Their relations with the *ghazis* were cordial and when the Turks became masters of the area, they converted in large numbers to Islam. Upon conversion, the nobles or local aristocracy in the *ghazis* areas were allowed to maintain their wealth and ancient privileges.

The *ghazzi* tradition was brought to an end by the Ottoman quest for Empire. The *ghazzis* were not allowed to expand beyond the areas of their early penetration. Organization rather than assimilation became the chief objective of the rapidly expanding Empire.

The *uch beys* were getting too powerful for the comfort of the Ottoman Sultans. A strong central government was necessary for the preservation of the Ottoman dynasty and Empire. The Janissary Corps, (composed of former Christians) the personal property of the Sultans, introduced by Orkhan I (1326-1359), as expanded during the reign of Murad I (1359-1389) in order to balance the power of the *uch beys*. The Balkan conquest was thus continued by the standing army of Janissaries²⁹ and Siphahis rather than the *ghazzis*.

The *ghazzi* tradition was ostensibly betrayed by the subjugation of the Muslim Anatolian peninsula by the Ottomans. This was one of the reasons why Timurlenk, as a champion of Islam, fought Bayizid in 1402. Under Mohammed II (1451-1481) the *ghazzis* were no longer an important element in the Ottoman system.

Aside from individual conversions to Islam prompted by the social, financial and political benefits of the Ottoman system, and with the exception of the Greek speaking Muslims of Crete, and the Rumanian speaking Muslims of Macedonia,³⁰ the destruction of the *ghazzi* tradition terminated the Islamization process in the Balkans.

CONCLUSIONS :

Space does not permit a discussion of all the complex factors in the Islamization process in Anatolia and the Balkans. Many of the factors are still unknown. However we may conclude from our study that some of the major factors were; the *ghazzi* tradition, the *ahkis*, dervish propaganda³¹ and population pressure caused by the large influx of Muslim Turkish settlers, especially into Anatolia. On the other hand, on psychological and material grounds, the growing predominance of Muslim peoples in the Ottoman Empire, as a result of its expansion in the Arab world, contributed to the decline of Muslim proselytism. The quest for empire and its ensuing responsibilities led to the natural decline of those forces most prominent in the Islamization process. The time element was another important factor. It took the *ghazzis* over four hundred years to subdue Anatolia. The Ottoman Janissaries crossed the Balkans in less than a hundred years. The Islamization process succeeded in those places in the Balkans where the *ghazzi* tradition was established—that is to say in areas where Ottoman rule was long established.

1. The various population exchange agreements arrived at during and after World War I between the various Balkan states and Turkey greatly helped to mitigate an important source of friction between these states.
2. Koprulu, Fuad, *Les Origines de l'Empire Ottoman*, Paris, 1935. Wittek, Paul, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*, London, 1938.
3. Michael Psellus, an important intellectual personage of the Eleventh Century, had turned from Aristotle to Plato, and revived the recondite doctrines of the Neo-platonic School. He numbered among his students several non-Christian Arabs.
4. The march society is well depicted in the famous epic of *Digenes Akrites* which was formulated in the Ninth or Tenth Centuries along the Byzantine-Arab border. The name *Digenes* means born of two different backgrounds, i.e. Christian and Muslim; *Akrites* as we have seen means a border area. Cf. Mavrogordato, John, ed., *Digenes Akrites*, Oxford, 1956.
5. Brockelmann, Carl, *The History of Islamic Peoples*, New York, 1947, p. 258.
6. The Latin sack of Constantinople in 1204 reinforced Byzantine power and influence in Asia Minor where the Greek Empire of Nicaea was established.
7. Rice, David T., *Byzantine Art*, London, 1954, pp. 229-230.
8. Buckler, G., *Anna Comnena*, London, 1929, p. 92.
9. Runciman, Steven, *Byzantine Civilization*, London, 1948, p. 131.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 331.
11. Runciman, S., *op. cit.* pp. 293-294.
12. Menzel, T., "Gagauz", *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, Vol. II, London, 1927, most of them lived in the Dobrudja but in the early Nineteenth Century migrated to Bessarabia because its new rulers, the Russians, were Orthodox Christians.
13. Kowalski, T., "Les Turcs et la Langue Turque de la Bulgarie du Nord Est", *Memoires de la Commission Orientaliste*, Polska Akademia Umiejetnosci, No. 16, Cracow, 1933.
14. Wittek, P., "Les Elements Ethniques Turcs de la Dobroudja", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, Vol. XIV, 1938, pp. 66-80.
15. Wittek, P., "Les Gagauzes - Les Gens de Kaykaus", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, Vol. XVII, Cracow, 1953, pp. 12-24.
16. "Yazijoghlu Ali on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol. XIV, 1952, pp. 639-668.
17. Birge, John K., *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, London, 1937, p. 210.
18. Hasluck, F. W., *Christianity and Islam Under the Sultans*, Vol. II, London, 1929, p. 378.
19. Brockelman, C., *op. cit.*, p. 255.
20. Hasluck, F. W. *op. cit.* Vol I, p. 166.
21. Kissling, Hans L., "The Sociological and Educational Role of the Dervish Orders in the Ottoman Empire", *The American Anthropologist*, Vol. 56, No. 2, Part 2, p. 28.
22. Hasluck, F. W., *op. cit.* Vol. II, p. 569.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 570-576. (The Kizilbash have close ties with the Bektashi and are often mistaken for them. They are strong in former Armenian areas and are thought to include large numbers of former Armenian Christians. In their personal relations, they are most sympathetic to Christian than Sunni Muslims.)
24. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 375-377.
25. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 372-373.
26. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 585.
27. Kissling, Hans J., *op. cit.*, p. 27.
28. Birge, John K., *op. cit.*, p. 29.
29. Von Grunbaum, G. E., "Islamic Studies and Cultural Research" *The American Anthropologists*, Vol. 56, No. 2, Memoir 72, 1954, p. 15.
30. Cahen, Claude, "Les Problemes Ethniques en Anatolie", *Journal of World History*, Vol. II, No. 2, Paris, 1954, pp. 347-362. The religious guilds had Christian members and the guest houses they established for the new immigrants coming into Anatolia at this time became the centers of many Turkish villages.
31. In the *ghazzi* tradition, the Capital city is near the line of advance when the Capital was brought to Constantinople in 1453, the *ghazzi* tradition was ostensibly over.
32. It is significant that the Patron Saint of the Janissary Corps was Hadji Bektash of the Bektashi Dervish Order.
33. The Turks took Crete from the Venetians (1649-1669). They were ably aided by the Cretans who were suffering from religious and economic persecutions from the hands of their Latin masters. The campaign had much in common with the *ghazzi* tradition. In a sense, it was a *ghazzi* revival.
34. The very small Megleno-Rumanian group of Macedonia was forcibly converted to Islam at a later date. Cf. Capidan, Theodore, *Les Macedo-Roumains*, Bucarest, 1943.
35. In the Balkans their success is appreciated by the fact that the Albanian Muslims of today are under strong Bektashi influence.

Notes and Comments

THE FOURTH LITURGICAL WEEK AT ST SERGIUS IN PARIS

(A Letter from Paris)

The "Week of Liturgical Studies" organized every year since 1953 at St. Sergius Orthodox Theological Academy in Paris, have become an important yearly event for liturgiologists of various countries and denominations. In fact, the "week" is an unique opportunity for specialists working in the same field, though separated by confessional barriers, to come together and discuss their problems, achievements and plans in a wonderful spirit of academic unity and Christian charity. Benedictines from Maria Laach, Beuron, Mont Cesar and Chevetogne, professors of the Pontificio Instituto Orientale of Rome, and Dominicans from Le Saulchois and Montreal, members of the Church of England, Theologians of the Reformed Church of France and Germany, Lutherans from Sweden—all are sitting in the same room vested in their various robes and gowns and participating in the same fraternal discussion which ultimately has but one object: the understanding of the "lex orandi"—the law of worship of the Church. The discussion is not "ecumenical" in any specific sense of the word, no common statements will be issued, no "agreements" and "disagreements", it is rather a technical and purely academic discussion. And yet, a wonderful feeling of fellowship, of real belonging to each other, emerges from these sessions as if this common interest for the mysterious reality of the "Ecclesia Orans", the Church in worship and in prayer is in itself a token of unity and understanding.

This year, the "week" was devoted to one general theme, "The Liturgical Year". It began on Monday, July 1 with the opening address of His Grace, Bishop Cassian, rector of St. Sergius Academy and then convened twice a day to hear and discuss 13 papers. Five of them were read by Roman Catholic Scholars: Dom Bernard Botte, O. S. B. of Mont Cesar, Belgium, "The Cult of the Old Testament Saints in the Christian Church"; Dom J. Capelle, O. S. B., "An Old Version of the Anaphora of St. Basil"; Dom Burkhard Neunheuser from Maria Laach, "The Presence of the Work of Christ in the Ecclesiastical Year in the Light of the Conceptions of O. Casel"; Fr. Balthasar Ficher of Trier, "The Role of the Psalm 'Qui Habitat' (Ps. XC) in the Roman Liturgy of the Quadragesima"; Fr. Alphonse Raes, S. J., "The Structure of the Armenian and Coptic Liturgical Year" and Dom Olivier Rousseau from Chevetogne, "The Liturgical Year and the Theology of Time in the Fathers". The Protestants were represented by the Rev. Allan MacArthur (author of the "Origin of the Liturgical Year") from Glasgow, "The Christian Year and the Lectionary Reform" and Prof. Harold Riesenfeld from Uppsala, Sweden, "The Sabbath and the Lord's Day in the New Testament and the Ancient Church". The Rev. E. C. Varah, London, of the Church of England spoke on "The Liturgical and Ecumenical Implications of the Proposed World Calendar". The Orthodox presented four papers: Andre Grabas of the College de France spoke on "The Byzantine Iconography of the Liturgical Year"; Bishop Cassian, "The Benediction of Water in the Light of the New Testament"; The Rev. Alexander Schmemmann, "The Origin of the Liturgical Year, the Liturgical dualism of the Primitive Church" and Prof. T. Spasky, "The Antefeast of Christmas".

About forty people were invited to attend the sessions of the "Week", among them—Prof. F. L. Cross of Oxford, Fr. J. P. Audet, O. P. from the Institute of Medieval Stud-

ies in Ottawa, F. E. Lannes from Chevetogne, Fr. Dumont from "Istina", Fr. Danielou, Canon Martimort (one of the leaders of the French Liturgical Movement), and many other leading representatives of contemporary liturgiology. All meals were taken in common at the Refectory and conversations and discussions continued through afternoons among the trees and flowers of St. Sergius' Academy campus.

St. Vladimir's Seminary was represented by Fr. William Schneirla and myself and this contact with St. Sergius Academy, which for some of us will forever remain the "alma mater", was extremely pleasant. The Rector, the Dean and the Faculty received us with love and friendship which we will not easily forget. The Director of the "week", the Rt. Rev. Archimandrite Cyprien Kern, who is to be fully credited for the success of the conference, honored our Seminary by asking me to chair one of the sessions. I can but express my hope that this "week" will strengthen the unity and cooperation of our schools, and that a greater number of Orthodox from America will attend the "week" next year.

A. SCHMEMANN

THE SEMINARY

FATHER REPELLA'S LIBRARY ACQUIRED BY THE SEMINARY: An event of exceptional importance marked the end of the academic year: the acquisition by the Seminary of Father Anthony Repella's theological library. Father Repella has been collecting books for some fifty years and his library is well known as a unique collection of Russian theological books and periodicals (complete sets of the "Theological Messenger", Theological Academy of Moscow, "Studies of the Theological Academy of Kiev", "Questions of Philosophy and Psychology", etc., works of all leading Russian theologians—Makary Bulgakov, Bishop Sylvester, Bolotov, Nesmelov, Philosophers—Khomiakoff, Solovieff, Kireevsky, innumerable monographs, Church Fathers, liturgical books, etc.) More than 7,000 volumes have been transferred to the Seminary and will be integrated into the Seminary Library during the Summer. Two years ago the Seminary was given the library of its late Dean the Metropolitan Makary. Now with the acquisition of this new collection, the Seminary Library can be considered without exaggeration, a unique center of research for all those working in the field of Orthodox Theology and Russian religious thought.

ARCHBISHOP IRINEY OF JAPAN AT THE SEMINARY: On May 16, Archbishop Iriney of Tokyo visited the Seminary which two Japanese students—Fr. Peter Sayama ('58) and Kirill Arihara ('58) are completing their theological studies. At the end of Vespers in the Chapel, Fr. Schmemann greeted him on behalf of the Faculty and students. Then in the common room, Archbishop Iriney gave a two hour lecture on the history and life of the Orthodox Church in Japan. After the lecture, he discussed the possibility of admitting two more Japanese students to the Seminary with Prof. Verkhovsky and Fr. Schmemann. It is hoped that someday graduates from St. Vladimir's Seminary will teach in the newly organized Orthodox Seminary in Tokyo.

THE FIRST FACULTY-STUDENT CONFERENCE: took place on May 17th. It was opened with a Divine Liturgy celebrated in the presence of His Eminence, The Metropolitan Leonty by Fathers Schmemann, Sayama and Kurban. At the first session, the theme of "The Ministry of the Church Today" was introduced by Professor Verkhovsky and then discussed by the members of the graduating class: G. Khmelev, J. Kozak, Fr. I. Kurban, M. Murja, R. Ofesh, A. Smirensky and W. Woszczulko. Fr. Peter Sayama spoke to the future graduates on behalf of the student body. The second session was devoted to a

general discussion of the Seminary Life, Curriculum, and faculty-student relationship.
ECUMENICAL ACTIVITIES: During the Summer, professors of St. Vladimir's will take part in the following ecumenical activities.

July 1-5, Fr. Schmemmann will present a paper on "The Liturgical Dualism of the Early Church" at the Liturgical Week, St. Sergius Theological Academy, Paris, France.
July 21-23, Prof. Verkhovsky will take part in the Working Committee of the Department on Cooperation of Men and Women in Church and Society, New Haven, Conn.
July 19-25, Fr. Schmemmann will be present at the Commission on Faith and Order, World Council of Churches, New Haven, Conn.

September 3-10, Prof. Verkhovsky, Frs. Schmemmann and Schneirla will be at the North American Study Conference on Faith and Order, Oberlin, Ohio.

June-July, Prof. N. Arseniev will be at the University of Bonn, Germany.

September 23-25, Fr. Schmemmann will deliver a series of lectures on "The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Church" at the Clergy Conference of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, California.